

Sharp Spectral Asymptotics for Operators with Irregular Coefficients. V. Multidimensional Schrödinger operator with a strong magnetic field. Not-Full-rank case

Victor Ivrii^{*†}

February 2, 2008

Abstract

This paper is a continuation of [BrIvr] and [Ivr1, Ivr5, Ivr6, Ivr7]. I derive sharp spectral asymptotics (with the remainder estimate $O(h^{1-d} + \mu^r h^{1-r-q})$ for d -dimensional Schrödinger operator with a strong magnetic field; here h and μ are Plank and binding constants respectively and magnetic intensity matrix has constant but not full rank $2r$ at each point and $q = d - 2r$).

0 Introduction

0.0 Preface

In this paper I consider multidimensional Schrödinger operator

$$(0.1) \quad A = A_0 + V(x), \quad A_0 = \sum_{j,k \leq d} P_j g^{jk}(x) P_k,$$

$$P_j = hD_j - \mu V_j(x), \quad h \in (0, 1], \quad \mu \geq 1.$$

^{*}Work was partially supported by NSERC grant OGP0138277.

[†]Work was partially supported by Canada Council for the Arts via Killam Program.

It is characterized by *magnetic field intensity matrix* (F_{jk}) with $F_{jk} = (\partial_{x_j} V_k - \partial_{x_k} V_j)$, which is skew-symmetric $d \times d$ -matrix, and $(F_p^j) = (g^{jk})(F_{kp})$ which is unitarily equivalent to skew-symmetric matrix $(g^{jk})^{\frac{1}{2}}(F_{jk})(g^{jk})^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Then all the eigenvalues of (F_k^j) (with multiplicities) are $\pm i f_p$ ($f_p > 0$, $p = 1, \dots, r$) and 0 of multiplicity $q = d - 2r$ where $2r = \text{rank}(F_k^j)$.

In this paper I assume that magnetic field intensity matrix has a constant but not full rank:

$$(0.2) \quad \text{rank}(F_{jk}) = 2r = d - q, \quad q \geq 1, \quad |((F_{jk})|_{\mathcal{N}^\perp})^{-1}| \leq c_0$$

where $\mathcal{N} = \text{Ker}(F_{jk})$ and $\mathcal{N}^\perp = \text{Ran}(F_{jk})$ and (under certain conditions) I derive sharp spectral asymptotics (with the remainder estimate $O(h^{1-d} + \mu^r h^{1-r-q})$). The typical example (already studied in [Ivr1, Ivr6]) is 3-dimensional magnetic Schrödinger operator.

Condition (0.2) is equivalent to

$$(0.3) \quad \text{rank}(F_{jk}) = 2r = d - q, \quad |f_p| \geq \epsilon_0 \quad p = 1, \dots, r.$$

I consider operator in some domain or on some manifold X with some boundary conditions, assuming that it is self-adjoint in L^2 and I denote by $e(x, y, \tau)$ Schwartz' kernel of it's spectral projector.

There is a profound difference between full-rank case considered in [Ivr7] and non-full-rank case considered here: in its canonical form full-rank magnetic Schrödinger operator is reduced to the family of r -dimensional $\mu^{-1}h$ -pdos and therefore we can expect asymptotics with the remainder estimate (in the smooth case) as good as $C(\mu h^{-1})^{r-1} \times (1 + (\mu h)^{-r}) \asymp (\mu^{-1}h^{1-d} + \mu^{r-1}h^{1-r})$ where the first factor is the remainder estimate for a single operator $\mu^{-1}h$ -pdo and the second factor is the number of these operators to be taken into account; however one needs some non-degeneracy (microhyperbolicity) condition; otherwise the remainder estimate could be as bad as $C(\mu h^{1-d} + \mu^r h^{-r})$ which is the magnitude of the principal part as $\mu \geq h^{-1}$.

On the other hand, in its canonical form non-full-rank magnetic Schrödinger operator is reduced to the family of q -dimensional Schrödinger operators which are also r -dimensional $\mu^{-1}h$ -pdos and in the best case we can expect asymptotics with the remainder estimate $C h^{1-q} \times (\mu h^{-1})^r \times (1 + (\mu h)^{-r})$ with the principal part of magnitude $h^{-q} \times (\mu h^{-1})^r \times (1 + (\mu h)^{-r})$; however, non-degeneracy condition is not needed at all (if smoothness allows) as $q \geq 2$; case $q = 1$ is more complicated.

We see that there is a more subtle distinction between $q = 1$ and $q \geq 2$; actually $q = 2$ might stay apart from $q \geq 3$ due to the lack of the smoothness. There is even more subtle distinction between $r = 1$ and $r \geq 2$ but it makes the difference only as $q = 0, 1$ setting $d = 2, 3$ a bit apart (and in fact it plays role mainly in the non-smooth case).

0.1 Assumptions. I

Note first that $\mathcal{N} = \text{Ker } F$ is integrable foliation of q -dimensional spaces, which means that for any y there exists q -dimensional manifold $N = N_y \ni y$ such that $T_x N = \mathcal{N}(x)$ at any point $x \in N$. Then there exists a coordinate system $x = (x'''; x^\perp) = (x_1, \dots, x_q; x_{q+1}, \dots, x_d)$ with $x^\perp = \text{const}$ along leafs N_y of the above foliation. This (almost) fixes $x^\perp$ and also implies that in this coordinate system $F_{jk} = 0$ as $j = 1, \dots, q$ (or $k = 1, \dots, q$). Then there exists function ϕ such that $V_j = \partial_j \phi$ for $j = 1, \dots, q$ and one can eliminate V_j for all $j = 1, \dots, q$ by a gauge transformation. So, we can assume that $V_j = 0$ as $j = 1, \dots, q$ and then $V_j = V_j(x^\perp)$ as $j = q+1, \dots, d$.

Now we assume that these reductions are already made and thus

$$(0.4) \quad F_{jk} = 0, \quad V_j = 0, \quad \partial_j V_k = 0 \quad \forall j = 2r+1, \dots, d \quad \forall k$$

and after these reductions

$$(0.5) \quad g^{jk}, F_{jk} \in C^{\bar{l}, \bar{\sigma}}, \quad V \in C^{l, \sigma},$$

$$(0.5)' \quad q = 1 \implies g^{jd} = \delta_{jd},$$

$$(0.6) \quad V_j = \partial_j \phi_j, \quad \phi_j \in C^{\bar{l}+2, \bar{\sigma}}$$

where $(\bar{l}, \bar{\sigma}) \succeq (l, \sigma) \succeq (1, 1)$. We also assume that

$$(0.7) \quad |V| \geq \epsilon$$

Strange-looking condition (0.6) will be needed in some cases to make global reductions to a canonical form.

0.2 Canonical Form

It is known (see e.g. [Ivr1], Chapter 6) that if $X = \mathbb{R}^d$ and g^{jk}, F_{jk}, V are constant then the magnetic Schrödinger operator is unitarily equivalent to operator

$$(0.8) \quad \sum_{1 \leq j \leq r} f_j (h^2 D_j^2 + \mu^2 x_j^2) + \sum_{r+1 \leq j \leq d-2r} h^2 D_j^2 + V$$

and that $e(x, x, \tau) = \mathcal{E}_d^{\text{MW}}(\tau)$ where

$$(0.9) \quad \mathcal{E}_d^{\text{MW}}(\tau) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \omega_{d-2r} (2\pi)^{-d+r} \mu^r h^{-d+r} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}^{+r}} \left(\tau - \sum_j (2\alpha_j + 1) f_j \mu h - V \right)_+^{\frac{q}{2}} f_1 \cdots f_r \sqrt{g}$$

and ω_k is a volume of unit ball, $g = \det(g^{jk})^{-1}$.

Now in the general case (for variable V and, may be, g^{jk}, F_{jk}) I am interested in the asymptotics of $\int e(x, x, 0)\psi(x) dx$ as $h \rightarrow +0, \mu \rightarrow +\infty$ where ψ is a fixed function, smooth and compactly supported in X .

It is known [Ivr1] that in the smooth case for $d = 3$ one can reduce magnetic Schrödinger operator to its canonical form

$$(0.10) \quad \mu^2 \sum_{m+p+j+k \geq 1} a_{m,p,j,k}(x_2, x_3, \mu^{-1}hD_2) \times \\ \times (x_1^2 + \mu^{-2}h^2D_1^2)^m (hD_3)^{2p} \mu^{-2m-2j-2p-k} h^k$$

with the “main part”

$$(0.10)_0 \quad a_{1,0,0}(x_2, x_3, \mu^{-1}hD_2) (\mu^2x_1^2 + h^2D_1^2) + h^2D_3^2 + a_{0,1,0}(x_2, x_3, \mu^{-1}hD_2).$$

with $a_{1,0,0} = F \circ \Psi_0$, $a_{0,1,0} = V \circ \Psi_0$ and certain diffeomorphism $\Psi_0 : T\mathbb{R}^1 \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$; we ignore terms with $k \geq 1$ or $m + p + j \geq 2$. Then one can replace harmonic oscillator $(h^2D_1^2 + \mu^2x_1^2)$ by one of its eigenvalues $(2\alpha + 1)\mu h$.

Multidimensional case is much more tricky. The main part of the canonical form will be

$$(0.11) \quad \sum_{j,k \leq r} Z_k^* a_{jk}^w(x'', x''', \mu^{-1}hD'') Z_j + \\ \sum_{2r+1 \leq j,k \leq d} h^2 D_j b_{jk}^w(x'', x''', \mu^{-1}hD'') D_k + a_0^w(x'', x''', \mu^{-1}hD'')$$

with $Z_j = (hD_j - i\mu x_j)$, $Z_j^* = (hD_j + i\mu x_j)$ $j = 1, \dots, r$, $x'' = (x_{r+1}, \dots, x_{2r})$, $x''' = (2r+1, \dots, d)$. Here $(a_{jk})_{j,k=1,\dots,r}$ is a Hermitean positive definite matrix with eigenvalues $f_1, \dots, f_r$ and $(b_{jk})_{j,k=2r+1,\dots,d}$ is a real symmetric positive definite matrix. We would like to have (a_{jk}) in the diagonal form; then instead of (0.11) we would have

$$(0.12) \quad \sum_j f_j^w(x'', x''', \mu^{-1}hD'') (H_j - \mu h) + \\ \sum_{2r+1 \leq j,k \leq d} h^2 D_j b_{jk}^w(x'', x''', \mu^{-1}hD'') D_k + a_0(x'', x''', \mu^{-1}hD'')^w$$

with 1-dimensional harmonic oscillators $H_j = (h^2D_j^2 + \mu^2x_j^2)$. However second-order resonances $f_j = f_k$ with $j \neq k$ prevent us; in the general case we can assume only that

locally

$$(0.13) \quad \sum_{\mathbf{m} \in \mathfrak{M}} \sum_{j,k \in \mathbf{m}} a_{jk}(x'', x''', \mu^{-1}hD'') Z_j^* Z_k + \sum_{2r+1 \leq j,k \leq d} h^2 D_j b_{jk}^w(x'', x''', \mu^{-1}hD'') D_k + a_0(x'', \mu^{-1}hD'', x'')$$

where $\mathbf{m} \in \mathfrak{M}$ are disjoint subsets of $\{1, \dots, r\}$ and eigenvalues of each of matrices $(a_{jk})_{j,k \in \mathbf{m}}$ are close to one another. This leads to the necessity of the matrix rather than the scalar non-degeneracy (microhyperbolicity) condition.

The reduction of non-principal terms of operator are prevented by higher-order resonances (see [Ivr7]); we discuss it later.

0.3 Microhyperbolicity

Thus we arrive to the final *microhyperbolicity condition* at point $\bar{z} = (\bar{x}'', \bar{x}''', \bar{\xi}'')$ and thus at point $\bar{x} = \Psi_0^{-1}(z)$:

Condition 0.1. Assume that

(0.14) First of all we assume that set $\{1, \dots, r\}$ is split into disjoint groups $\mathbf{m} \in \mathfrak{M}(\bar{z})$ and matrix (a_{ij}) is block-diagonal and in a small vicinity of $\bar{z}$ its blocks are close to scalar matrices $f_{\mathbf{m}} I_{\#\mathbf{m}}$ where $f_{\mathbf{m}}$ are disjoint.

(0.15) Finally, we assume that for each real vector $\boldsymbol{\tau} = (\tau_{\mathbf{m}})_{\mathbf{m} \in \mathfrak{M}}$ such that $|\sum_{\mathbf{m} \in \mathfrak{M}} \tau_{\mathbf{m}} + V| \leq \epsilon$ there exists vector $\ell = \ell(\bar{z}, \boldsymbol{\tau}) \in \mathbb{R}^{2r+q}$ such that

$$(0.16) \quad \mu^2 \sum_{j,k} (\ell(a_{jk} a_0^{-1})) \zeta_j^\dagger \zeta_k \geq \epsilon_1 \quad \forall \zeta \in \mathbb{C}^r$$

as long as

$$(0.17) \quad a_{\mathbf{m}} = \sum_{j,k \in \mathbf{m}} a_{jk} \zeta_j^\dagger \zeta_k = \mu^2 \tau_{\mathbf{m}} \quad \forall \mathbf{m} \in \mathfrak{M}.$$

To impose this condition we need to assume first that symbol a_0 does not vanish; thus we need assumption (0.7).

Note, that contrast to [Ivr8] I no longer consider $\mathfrak{N}$ partition of $\{1, \dots, r\}$ joining in one group all possible third-order resonances as well; the reason is that now we need to consider evolution with $|t| \leq \epsilon_0$ instead of $|t| \leq \epsilon_0 \mu$ as it was in [Ivr8] and therefore third-order resonances are not a problem anymore here.

Condition 0.2. The above microhyperbolicity condition should be modified as $\mu h \geq \epsilon_0$: in (0.16) – (0.17) one needs to consider only $\tau_{\mathfrak{m}} = \sum_{i \in \mathfrak{m}} (2\alpha_i + 1)\mu h f_i$ with $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{Z}^+$; now τ runs a discrete set.

On the other hand, for constant matrix (F_j^k) condition (0.16)-(0.17) is equivalent to

$$(0.18) \quad |\nabla V| \geq \epsilon_1;$$

and for $\mu h \geq \epsilon_0$ one should modify it to

$$(0.19) \quad \left| \sum_i (2\alpha_i + 1)\mu h + V \right| + |\nabla V| \geq \epsilon_1 \quad \forall \alpha \in \mathbb{Z}^{+r}.$$

Then we basically do not need condition (0.7). Also in this case one can take ℓ which does not depend on τ .

0.4 Results

The first group of results uses no canonical form and is related to a relatively weak magnetic field. We consider two cases: without and with microhyperbolicity condition respectively.

0.4.1 Weak Magnetic Field. I

Theorem 0.3. *Let conditions (0.1) – (0.5), (0.7) be fulfilled, $\mu \leq h^{\delta-1}$ and*

$$(0.20) \quad \textit{Either } q \geq 2 \textit{ and } (l, \sigma) \succeq (1, 1) \textit{ or } q = 1 \textit{ and } (l, \sigma) \succeq (1, 2).$$

Then there exist two framing approximations¹ such that for both of them

$$(0.21) \quad \mathcal{R} = \left| \int \left(e(x, x, \tau) - \mathcal{E}^{\text{MW}}(x, \tau) \right) \psi(x) dx \right| \leq C h^{1-d} + C \mu h^{1-d} (\mu h |\log h|)^{\frac{q}{2}}.$$

Remark 0.4. (i) Theorem 0.3 uses no non-degeneracy condition and it does not benefit from stronger smoothness assumptions.

(ii) For $\mu \leq \bar{\mu}_{1(q)} = C(h |\log h|)^{-\frac{q}{q+2}}$ remainder estimate $O(h^{1-d})$ holds; in particular, $\bar{\mu}_{1(1)} = C(h |\log h|)^{-\frac{1}{3}}$, $\bar{\mu}_{1(2)} = C(h |\log h|)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ and $\bar{\mu}_{1(q)} \geq C(h |\log h|)^{-\frac{3}{5}}$ as $q \geq 3$.

¹I.e. operators $A^\pm$ such that $A^+ \geq A \geq A^-$ in the operator sense.

0.4.2 Weak Magnetic Field. II

To push μ in theorem 0.3 up² we need microhyperbolicity condition and extra smoothness.

Theorem 0.5. *Let conditions (0.1) – (0.5), (0.7), (0.20) be fulfilled and $\mu \leq h^{\delta-1}$.*

Let microhyperbolicity condition 0.1 be fulfilled. Then

(i) The following estimate holds

$$(0.22) \quad \mathcal{R} \leq Ch^{1-d} + Ch^{-d}(\mu h)^{l+\frac{q}{2}} |\log h|^{l+\frac{q}{2}-\sigma} + C\mu h^{-d}(\mu h)^{\bar{l}+1+\frac{q}{2}} |\log h|^{\bar{l}+1+\frac{q}{2}-\bar{\sigma}};$$

(ii) Furthermore, if either $\mu \leq \bar{\mu}_2 = C(h|\log h|)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ or $\ell_{\perp} = 0$ in microhyperbolicity condition, then one can skip the last term in the right-hand expression of (0.22):

$$(0.23) \quad \mathcal{R} \leq Ch^{1-d} + Ch^{-d}(\mu h)^{l+\frac{q}{2}} |\log h|^{l+\frac{q}{2}-\sigma};$$

(iii) In particular, $\mathcal{R} \leq Ch^{1-d}$ as $q = 1$, $(l, \sigma) = (\frac{3}{2}, 1)$ and $\mu \leq \bar{\mu}_2$.

Note that for μ close to h^{-1} the last term in (0.22) could be larger than the principal part.

0.4.3 Intermediate Magnetic Field. I

We assume first that microhyperbolicity condition 0.1 holds.

Let us assume now that

$$(0.24) \quad \bar{\mu}_2 = Ch^{-\frac{1}{2}} |\log h|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \leq \mu \leq \bar{\mu}_3 = \epsilon h^{-1} |\log h|^{-1}.$$

The low bound is justified as $q \geq 2$ since otherwise theorem 0.3 provides $O(h^{1-d})$ remainder estimate. For $q = 1$ justification is that we will need to take $\varepsilon = C\mu^{-1}$ and it is smaller than $\varepsilon = C\mu h |\log h|$ used in the previous results if and only if $\mu \geq \bar{\mu}_2$. The only exception (when we can take $\varepsilon = C(\mu^{-1}h |\log h|)^{\frac{1}{2}}$) is the case $r = 1$ but then $q \geq 2$ since we assume that $d \geq 4$.

Theorem 0.6. *Let conditions (0.1) – (0.7), (0.20) and (0.24) be fulfilled and let microhyperbolicity condition 0.1 be fulfilled. Then*

$$(0.25) \quad \mathcal{R} \leq Ch^{1-d} + Ch^{-d}(\mu h |\log h|)^{\frac{q}{2}} \mu^{-l} |\log h|^{-\sigma}.$$

Corollary 0.7. *Under microhyperbolicity condition for $\mu \leq \bar{\mu}_3$ sharp remainder estimate $\mathcal{R} \leq Ch^{1-d}$ holds as either $q \geq 2$, $(l, \sigma) \succeq (1, 1)$ or $q = 1$, $(l, \sigma) \succeq (\frac{3}{2}, 1)$.*

²Actually we need to do this for $q = 1$ only.

0.4.4 Intermediate Magnetic Field case. II

Now let us consider intermediate magnetic field without microhyperbolicity condition. Then essentially we have a degenerate matrix operator. To such operator we can apply rescaling technique in its crudest form leading us to

Theorem 0.8. *Let conditions (0.1) – (0.7), (0.20) and (0.24) be fulfilled. Then*

- (i) *For $q \geq 3$, $(l, \sigma) = (1, 1)$, $(\bar{l}, \bar{\sigma}) = (2, 1)$ estimate $\mathcal{R} \leq Ch^{1-d}$ holds;*
- (ii) *For $q = 2$, $(l, \sigma) = (1, 1)$, $(\bar{l}, \bar{\sigma}) = (2, 1)$ estimate*

$$(0.26) \quad \mathcal{R} \leq Ch^{1-d} + C\mu h^{\frac{5}{3}-d}$$

holds; in particular, $\mathcal{R} \leq Ch^{1-d}$ as $\mu \leq h^{-\frac{2}{3}}$;

- (iii) *For $q = 1$, $(l, \sigma) = (1, 2)$ estimate*

$$(0.27) \quad \mathcal{R} \leq Ch^{1-d} + C\mu h^{\frac{4}{3}-d} + C\mu^{\frac{1}{2}} h^{1-d}$$

holds.

Note that estimates (0.26), (0.27) are better than (0.21) with $q = 2, 1$ respectively iff $\mu \geq h^{-\frac{1}{2}} |\log h|^{-\frac{1}{2}}$.

The second terms in (0.26), (0.27) are due to remainder estimates for q -dimensional Schrödinger operator (it is not important that operator in question is also r -dimensional $\mu^{-1}h$ -pdo). These estimates correspond to the $C^{1,1}$ -smoothness and cannot be improved in the general case even if we assume much larger smoothness because we have a matrix, not a scalar h -pdo as for $d = 3$. However, in certain cases we can do better than this; we need to consider $q = 1, 2$ only.

In (0.27) the third term estimates an approximation error arising when we skip irreducible $O(\mu^{-1})$ terms due; we can prevent these terms under certain conditions.

Theorem 0.9. *Let $q = 1$, $(1, 2) \preceq (l, \sigma) \preceq (2, 0)$ and conditions (0.1) – (0.7), (0.24) be fulfilled. Then*

- (i) *Estimate*

$$(0.28) \quad \mathcal{R}_I \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left| \int \left(e(x, x, \tau) - \mathcal{E}^{\text{MW}}(x, \tau) - \mathcal{E}_{\text{corr}}^{\text{MW}}(x, \tau) \right) \psi(x) dx \right|$$

$$\leq Ch^{1-d} + C\mu h^{\frac{4}{3}-d} + C\mu^{1-\frac{1}{2}} h^{1-d} |\log h|^{-\frac{\sigma}{2}}$$

holds where

$$(0.29) \quad |\mathcal{E}_{\text{corr}}^{\text{MW}}(x, \tau)| \leq C\mu^{\frac{1}{2}} h^{1-d}$$

will be defined by formula (5.67) and in the general case one cannot improve estimates (0.27), (0.29);

(ii) If one of conditions

(0.30) There are no third-order resonances

(0.31) $g^{jk} = \text{const}$, $F_{jk} = \text{const}$

is fulfilled then estimate (0.28) holds for $\mathcal{R}$.

As $r \geq 2$ condition (0.24) is fulfilled let us consider

$$(0.32) \quad \mathbf{n}_0(x, \hbar, \tau) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \#\left\{\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}^{+r}, \sum_j (2\alpha_j + 1)f_j(x)\hbar + V(x) < \tau\right\}.$$

Let us assume that estimate

$$(0.33) \quad \left| \int_{B(0,1)} (\mathbf{n}_0(x, \hbar, \tau') - \mathbf{n}_0(x, \hbar, \tau)) dx \right| \leq C\hbar^{-r}(|\tau - \tau'| + \nu(\hbar))$$

$$\forall \hbar \in (0, 1) \quad \forall \tau, \tau' : |\tau| \leq \epsilon, |\tau'| \leq \epsilon$$

holds with $\nu(\hbar) = o(\hbar)$.

Estimate (0.33) holds with $\nu(\hbar) = \hbar$ for sure and it holds with $\nu(\hbar) = \hbar^\kappa$, $\kappa > 1$ if either f_j have constant multiplicities and $\text{rank}\{\nabla \frac{f_2}{f_1}, \dots, \nabla \frac{f_r}{f_1}\} \geq \kappa - 1$ for all x or $\frac{f_j}{f_1} = \text{const}$ and system $\{\frac{f_2}{f_1}, \dots, \frac{f_r}{f_1}\}$ has some Diophantine properties³. Under condition (0.33) we can improve theorems 0.8, 0.9 as $q = 1, 2$:

Theorem 0.10. *Let $q = 1, 2$ and conditions (0.1) – (0.7), (0.24), (0.33) be fulfilled.*

Then

(i) *For $q = 2$, $(l, \sigma) = (1, 1)$, $(\bar{l}, \bar{\sigma}) = (2, 1)$ estimate*

$$(0.34) \quad \mathcal{R} \leq Ch^{1-d} + C\nu(\mu h)h^{\frac{2}{3}-d}$$

holds;

(ii) *For $q = 1$, $(1, 2) \preceq (l, \sigma) \preceq (2, 0)$ estimates*

$$(0.35) \quad \mathcal{R} \leq Ch^{1-d} + C\mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}h^{\frac{1}{2}-d}|\log h|^{\frac{1}{2}} + C\nu(\mu h)\left(h^{\frac{1}{3}-d} + \mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}h^{-d}\right),$$

$$(0.36) \quad \mathcal{R}_I \leq Ch^{1-d} + C\mu^{\frac{1}{2}-l}h^{\frac{1}{2}-d}|\log h|^{\frac{1}{2}-\sigma} + C\left(\nu(\mu h) + \mu^{-1}\right) \times \left(h^{\frac{1}{3}-d} + \mu^{-\frac{l}{2}}h^{-d}|\log h|^{-\frac{\sigma}{2}}\right)h^{-d}$$

³See examples 4.13, 4.14 for details.

hold;

(iii) For $q = 1$, $(1, 2) \preceq (l, \sigma) \preceq (2, 0)$ as one of conditions (0.30), (0.31) is fulfilled the following estimate holds:

$$(0.37) \quad \mathcal{R} \leq Ch^{1-d} + C\mu^{\frac{3}{2}-l}h^{\frac{3}{2}-d}|\log h|^{\frac{1}{2}-\sigma} + C\nu(\mu h)\left(h^{\frac{1}{3}-d} + \mu^{-\frac{l}{2}}h^{-d}|\log h|^{-\frac{\sigma}{2}}\right).$$

Improved version of theorem 0.10(i) when for $\mathcal{R}_I$ estimate (0.37) holds will be formulated later (theorem 5.12).

0.4.5 Intermediate Magnetic Field case. III

Assume now that

(0.38) Matrix (F_k^j) has eigenvalues $\pm if_m$ of constant multiplicities.

Then microhyperbolicity condition 0.1 is equivalent to

$$(0.39) \quad |V + \sum_{1 \leq j \leq r} f_j \tau_j| + |\nabla(V + \sum_{1 \leq j \leq r} f_j \tau_j)| \geq \epsilon \quad \forall \tau_1, \dots, \tau_r \in \mathbb{R}^+.$$

Further, if $f_2/f_1 = \text{const}, \dots, f_r/f_1 = \text{const}$ then (0.39) is equivalent to

$$(0.40) \quad |\nabla \frac{V}{f_1}| \geq \epsilon.$$

Theorem 0.11. *Let conditions (0.1) – (0.7), (0.20) and (0.38) be fulfilled. Then*

(i) For $q = 2$, $(1, 1) \preceq (l, \sigma) \preceq (2, 0)$, $(\bar{l}, \bar{\sigma}) = (2, 1)$ estimate

$$(0.41) \quad \mathcal{R} \leq Ch^{1-d} + C\mu h^{1-d+\frac{ql}{l+2}}|\log \mu|^{-\frac{q\sigma}{(l+2)}}$$

holds.

In particular, $\mathcal{R} \leq Ch^{1-d}$ as $(l, \sigma) = (2, 0)$.

(ii) As $q = 1$, $(1, 2) \preceq (l, \sigma) \preceq (2, 0)$, $(\bar{l}, \bar{\sigma}) = (2, 1)$ estimate

$$(0.42) \quad \mathcal{R}_I \leq Ch^{1-d} + C\mu h^{2-d-\frac{2}{l+2}}|\log h|^{-\frac{\sigma}{(l+2)}} + Ch^{1-d}(\mu h|\log h|)^{\frac{1}{2}}\mu^{1-l}|\log h|^{-\sigma} + C\mu^{1-\frac{l}{2}}h^{1-d}|\log h|^{-\frac{\sigma}{2}} + C\mu^{\frac{2l+1}{3l}}h^{\frac{4}{3}-d}|\log h|^{-\frac{\sigma}{3l}}$$

holds.

(iii) As $q = 1$, $(1, 2) \preceq (l, \sigma) \preceq (2, 0)$, $(\bar{l}, \bar{\sigma}) = (2, 1)$ and one of conditions (0.30), (0.31) is fulfilled estimate

$$(0.43) \quad \mathcal{R} \leq Ch^{1-d} + C\mu h^{2-d-\frac{2}{l+2}} |\log h|^{-\frac{\sigma}{l+2}} + \\ Ch^{1-d}(\mu h |\log h|)^{\frac{1}{2}} \mu^{1-l} |\log h|^{-\sigma} + C\mu^{1-\frac{l}{2}} h^{1-d} |\log h|^{-\frac{\sigma}{2}}$$

holds.

Note that the right-hand expression of (0.42) contains an extra term (in comparison with (0.43)).

Also note that for $q = 1$ estimate (0.41) is better than (0.21) as

$$(0.44) \quad \mu^{l+1} h |\log h|^{\sigma+1} \geq 1;$$

in particular, as $(l, \sigma) = (2, 0)$ we get estimate $\mathcal{R} \leq Ch^{1-d} + C\mu h^{\frac{3}{2}-d}$ which always is better than (0.21) as $\mu \geq \bar{\mu}_{1(1)}$.

Under condition (0.33) one can improve theorem 0.11:

Theorem 0.12. *Let conditions (0.1) – (0.7), (0.20) and (0.38), (0.33) be fulfilled. Then*

(i) *As $q = 2$, $(1, 1) \preceq (l, \sigma) \preceq (2, 0)$, $(\bar{l}, \bar{\sigma}) = (2, 1)$ estimate*

$$(0.45) \quad \mathcal{R} \leq Ch^{1-d} + C\nu(\mu h) h^{1-d+\frac{l-2}{l+2}} |\log h|^{-\frac{2\sigma}{l+2}}$$

holds.

(ii) *As $q = 1$, $(1, 2) \preceq (l, \sigma) \preceq (2, 0)$, $(\bar{l}, \bar{\sigma}) = (2, 1)$ and one of conditions (0.30), (0.31) is fulfilled estimate*

$$(0.46) \quad \mathcal{R} \leq Ch^{1-d} + Ch^{-d}(\mu h |\log h|)^{\frac{1}{2}} \mu^{-l} |\log h|^{-\sigma} \\ C\nu(\mu h) \left(h^{1-d-\frac{2}{l+2}} |\log h|^{-\frac{\sigma}{l+2}} + C\mu^{-\frac{l}{2}} h^{-d} |\log h|^{-\frac{\sigma}{2}} \right)$$

holds.

Improved version of theorem 0.11(ii) will be formulated later (theorem ??).

0.4.6 Strong and Superstrong Magnetic Field

Let us assume that

$$(0.47) \quad \epsilon h^{-1} |\log h|^{-1} \leq \mu \leq Ch^{-1}.$$

Then we must pick up

$$(0.48) \quad \varepsilon \geq C(\mu^{-1} h |\log h|)^{\frac{1}{2}} + Ch |\log h| \asymp h |\log h|$$

Still theorem 0.8 remains true:

Theorem 0.13. *Let conditions (0.1) – (0.7), (0.20) and (0.47) be fulfilled. Then*

- (i) *For $q \geq 3$, $(l, \sigma) = (1, 1)$, $(\bar{l}, \bar{\sigma}) = (2, 1)$ sharp remainder estimate $\mathcal{R} \leq Ch^{1-d}$ holds.*
- (ii) *For $q = 2$, $(l, \sigma) = (1, 1)$, $(\bar{l}, \bar{\sigma}) = (2, 1)$ estimate (0.26) holds: $\mathcal{R} \leq C\mu h^{\frac{5}{3}-d}$.*
- (iii) *For $q = 1$, $(1, 2) \preceq (l, \sigma) \preceq (\bar{l}, \bar{\sigma}) = (2, 1)$ estimate (0.27) holds: $\mathcal{R} \leq C\mu h^{\frac{4}{3}-d}$.*

Theorems 0.6, 0.9 and Corollary 0.7 require some kind of localization with respect to a_m defined by (0.17); however, this localization is not needed if either $r = 1$ and $d = 4$, or microhyperbolicity condition (namely condition 0.1 as $\mu \leq \epsilon h^{-1}$ or condition 0.2 as $\epsilon h^{-1} \leq \mu \leq Ch^{-1}$) holds with vector ℓ which does not depend on τ . If this is the case, theorem 0.6 and corollary 0.7 still hold.

This localization with respect to a_m can be done on Hermite decomposition level as long as there no higher order terms; we can skip them with error not exceeding $O(h^{1-d})$ as $q = 2$. Then for $q = 2$ theorems 0.6, 0.9 and corollary 0.7 remain true.

Also these statements remain true for $q = 1$ if there are no unremovable $O(\mu^{-1})$ terms i.e. if one of conditions (0.30), (0.31) is fulfilled.

If $q = 1$ and there are unremovable $O(\mu^{-1})$ terms, this procedure brings an approximation error $O(\mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}h^{\frac{1}{2}-d})$ under microhyperbolicity condition and $O(\mu^{\frac{1}{2}}h^{1-d})$ without it. This error estimate would not exceed remainder estimate as $\mu \geq \epsilon h^{-1}$.

Further, in this particular case when $q = 1$, $r \geq 2$, $\mu \leq \epsilon \mu h$ and both conditions (0.30), (0.31) are violated we can still localize a_m by microlocal arguments similar to those of [Ivr8] provided

$$(0.49) \quad \varepsilon \geq C(\mu^{-1}h|\log h|)^{\frac{1}{2}}e^{C\mu h|\log h|} + Ch|\log h|.$$

One can check easily that an approximation error is less than the corresponding remainder estimate unless $l = 1$ and we are looking at theorem 0.6; in the latter case an approximation error is

$$(0.50) \quad C(\mu^{-1}h|\log h|)^{\frac{1}{2}}e^{C\mu h|\log h|}h^{-d}|\log h|^{-\sigma}.$$

Thus we arrive to

Theorem 0.14. *Theorem 0.9 remains true with condition (0.24) replaced by (0.47). In particular, in estimate (0.28) the third term is less than the second one.*

Theorem 0.15. *Let conditions (0.1) – (0.7), (0.20) and (0.47) be fulfilled, $q = 1, 2$. Let microhyperbolicity condition 0.1 (as $\mu h \leq \epsilon$) or 0.2 (as $\mu h \geq \epsilon$) be fulfilled.*

- (i) *Let either $q = 2$, or $\mu \geq \epsilon h^{-1}$ or microhyperbolicity condition be fulfilled with vector ℓ independent on τ , or one of conditions (0.30), (0.31) be fulfilled, or $l > 1$.*

Then estimate $\mathcal{R} \leq Ch^{1-d}$ holds.

(ii) Otherwise estimate

$$(0.51) \quad \mathcal{R} \leq Ch^{1-d} e^{C\mu h |\log h|} |\log h|^{1-\sigma}$$

holds.

The same "drop unremovable terms" arguments could be applied in frames of theorems 0.10-0.12 leading us to

Theorem 0.16. *Under condition (0.24) replaced by (0.47)*

(i) *Theorems 0.10, 0.11(i),(iii), 0.12 remain true;*

(ii) *In frames of theorem 0.11(ii) estimate*

$$(0.52) \quad \mathcal{R} \leq Ch^{1-d} + C\mu h^{2-d-\frac{2}{l+2}} |\log h|^{-\frac{l\sigma}{2(l+2)}} + C\mu^{\frac{1}{2}} h^{1-d}$$

holds and one can skip the last term unless $(l, \sigma) \succ (2, -2)$.

0.4.7 Ultrastrong Magnetic Field

Finally let us assume that

$$(0.53) \quad \mu \geq Ch^{-1}$$

Then we need to modify the second part of condition (0.5), replacing (0.5) by

$$(0.5)^* \quad g^{jk}, F_{jk} \in C^{\bar{l}, \bar{\sigma}}, \quad W = V + \mu h \sum_j f_j \in C^{l, \sigma}$$

and assuming that

$$(0.54) \quad W + 2f_j \mu h \geq \epsilon \quad \forall j.$$

Under these assumptions we have really a scalar operator, and should take

$$(0.55) \quad \varepsilon = Ch |\log h|$$

and microhyperbolicity condition 0.2 transforms into

$$(0.56) \quad |W| + |\nabla W| \geq \epsilon.$$

Theorem 0.17. *Let conditions (0.1) – (0.4), (0.5)*, (0.6), (0.7), (0.20), (0.53) and (0.54) be fulfilled.*

Then

(i) *The principal part of asymptotics is*

$$(0.57) \quad \int \mathcal{E}_d^{\text{MW}}(x, \tau) \psi(x) dx = \omega_{d-2r} (2\pi)^{-d+r} \mu^r h^{-d+r} \int \left(\tau - \sum_j f_j \mu h - V \right)_+^{\frac{q}{2}} f_1 \cdots f_r \sqrt{g} \psi(x) dx$$

of magnitude $(\mu h)^r h^{-d}$.

(ii) *For $q \geq 3$, $(l, \sigma) = (1, 1)$, $(\bar{l}, \bar{\sigma}) = (2, 1)$ estimate*

$$(0.58) \quad \mathcal{R} \leq C(\mu h)^r h^{1-d}$$

holds.

(ii) *For $q = 1, 2$, under microhyperbolicity condition 0.2 (coinciding with (0.56)) estimate (0.58) holds.*

(iii) *For $q = 2$, $(1, 1) \preceq (l, \sigma) \preceq (2, 0)$, $(\bar{l}, \bar{\sigma}) = (2, 1)$ estimate*

$$(0.59) \quad \mathcal{R} \leq C(\mu h)^r h^{1-d} + C(\mu h)^r h^{1-d+\frac{l-2}{l+2}} |\log h|^{-\frac{2\sigma}{l+2}}$$

holds. In particular, for $(l, \sigma) = (2, 0)$ estimate (0.58) holds.

(iv) *For $q = 1$, $(1, 2) \preceq (l, \sigma) \preceq (2, 0)$, $(\bar{l}, \bar{\sigma}) = (2, 1)$ estimate*

$$(0.60) \quad \mathcal{R} \leq C(\mu h)^r h^{1-d-\frac{2}{l+2}} |\log h|^{-\frac{\sigma}{2(l+2)}}$$

holds.

0.5 Plan of the paper

Tiny section 1 contains preliminary remarks. In section 2 we develop weak magnetic field approach to cover both weak magnetic field case and the exterior zone in the intermediate magnetic field case. In section 3 we reduce operator to its canonical form. Section 4 is devoted to remainder estimate with implicitly defined main part of asymptotics, which is simplified and calculated in section 5. Tiny section 6 contains some closing remarks.

1 Preliminary remarks

We repeat section 1 of [Ivr6]. First of all, proposition 1.1 of [Ivr6] remains true (arguments repeat those of subsection 1.1 of that paper). On the other hand, proposition 1.2 is replaced by two following statements with

$$(1.1) \quad \tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{\text{MW}}(\tau) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (2\pi)^{-d+r} \mu^r h^{-d+r} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}^{+r}} \int_{\{\tau - \sum_j (2\alpha_j + 1) \tilde{f}_j \mu h - \tilde{V} + |\xi'''|^2 \leq 0\}} \tilde{f}_1 \cdots \tilde{f}_r \sqrt{\tilde{g}} d\xi'''$$

where $\tilde{f}_j$ are eigenvalues of matrix $(\tilde{F}_m^j) = (\tilde{g}^{jk})(\tilde{F}_{km})$ and $\tilde{g}^{jk}$, $\tilde{F}_{km}$, $\tilde{V}$ are corresponding mollifications; here ε depends on $|\xi'''|$.

Proposition 1.1. *Let $q \geq 2$ $(l, \sigma) = (1, 1)$. Let $(\bar{l}, \bar{\sigma}) = (2, 1)$ in statements (ii), (iii).*

(i) *Let $\mu \leq h^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. Let us define*

$$(1.2) \quad \varepsilon = \begin{cases} C\rho^{-1}h|\log h| & \rho \geq \bar{\rho}_1 = \max(\mu^{-1}, (\mu h|\log h|)^{\frac{1}{2}}), \\ C\mu h|\log h| & \rho \leq \bar{\rho}_1 \end{cases}$$

with $\rho = |\xi'''|$. Then the following estimate

$$(1.3) \quad \mathcal{R}' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left| \int \psi(x) \left(\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{\text{MW}}(x, \tau) - \mathcal{E}^{\text{MW}}(x, \tau) \right) dx \right| \leq Ch^{1-d} \quad \forall |\tau| \leq \epsilon.$$

(ii) *Let $h^{-\frac{1}{2}}|\log h|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \leq \mu \leq h^{-1}|\log h|^{-1}$. Let us define*

$$(1.4) \quad \varepsilon = \begin{cases} C\rho^{-1}h|\log h| + \mu^{-1}\bar{\rho}_1^s \rho^{-s} & \rho \geq \bar{\rho}_1 = (\mu h|\log h|)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \\ C\mu^{-1} & \rho \leq (\mu h|\log h|)^{\frac{1}{2}} \end{cases}$$

with $\rho = |\xi'''|$. Then estimate (1.3) holds.

(iii) *Let $\mu \geq h^{-1}|\log h|^{-1}$, $\varepsilon = (\mu^{-1}h|\log h|)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Then*

$$(1.5) \quad \mathcal{R}' \leq C(1 + \mu h)^r h^{1-d} \quad \forall |\tau| \leq \epsilon.$$

Proposition 1.2. (i) *Let $q = 1$, $(1, 2) \prec (l, \sigma) \prec (2, 0)$. Let $(\bar{l}, \bar{\sigma}) = (2, 1)$ in statements (ii), (iii).*

(i) *Let $\mu \leq h^{-\frac{1}{3}}$. Let us define ε by (1.4). Then estimate (1.3) holds.*

(ii) Let $h^{-\frac{1}{3}}|\log h|^{-\frac{1}{3}}\mu \leq h^{-1}|\log h|^{-1}$. Let us define ε by (1.4). Then under microhyperbolicity condition 0.1

$$(1.6) \quad \mathcal{R}' \leq Ch^{1-d} + Ch^{-d}(\mu h|\log h|)^{\frac{1}{2}}\mu^{-l}|\log h|^{-\sigma} \quad \forall |\tau| \leq \epsilon$$

and without it

$$(1.7) \quad \mathcal{R}' \leq Ch^{1-d} + Ch^{-d}(\mu h|\log h|)^{\frac{d}{2}}\mu^{-l}|\log h|^{-\sigma} + C\mu^{1-\frac{l}{2}}h^{1-d}|\log h|^{-\frac{\sigma}{2}} \quad \forall |\tau| \leq \epsilon.$$

(iii) Let $\mu \geq h^{-1}|\log h|^{-1}$, $\varepsilon = (\mu^{-1}h|\log h|)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Then under microhyperbolicity condition 0.1

$$(1.8) \quad \mathcal{R}' \leq C(1 + \mu h)^r h^{1-d} \quad \forall |\tau| \leq \epsilon.$$

and without it

$$(1.9) \quad \mathcal{R}' \leq C(1 + \mu h)^r h^{\frac{1}{2}-d} + (1 + \mu h)^r h^{-d} \mu^{-\frac{l}{2}}|\log h|^{-\frac{\sigma}{2}} \quad \forall |\tau| \leq \epsilon.$$

2 Weak magnetic field case

Analysis in this case follows one section 5 of [Ivr6] without serious modifications. We assume that $\mu \leq h^{\delta-1}$. Let us assume that f operator conditions (0.2)–(0.5) are fulfilled.

2.1 Preliminary remarks

Let us start from the case (further restrictions to follow)

$$(2.1) \quad \varepsilon \geq Ch|\log h|, \quad \mu \leq C^{-1}h^{-1}|\log h|^{-1}.$$

Obviously

$$(2.2) \quad [P_j, P_k] = i\mu h F_{jk}$$

and all the commutators

$$(2.3) \quad h^{-1}[A, x_j] = \sum_k (g^{jk} P_k + P_k g^{jk}),$$

$$(2.4) \quad h^{-1}[A, P_m] = h^{-1} \sum_{j,k} P_j [g^{jk}, P_m] P_k + h^{-1}[V, P_m] \quad m = 1, \dots, 2r,$$

$$(2.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \mu^{-1} h^{-1}[A, P_m] &= \sum_{j,k} (g^{jk} F_{jm} P_k + P_j g^{jk} F_{km}) + \\ &\quad \mu^{-1} h^{-1} \sum_{j,k} P_j [g^{jk}, P_m] P_k + \mu^{-1} h^{-1}[V, P_m] \quad m = 2r+1, \dots, d \end{aligned}$$

have symbols of the class $\mathcal{F}^{l,\sigma}$ in any domain $\{a(x, \xi) \leq c\mu^{-2}\}$ of the bounded energy where

$$(2.6) \quad a(x, \xi) = a_0(x, \xi) + V, \quad a_0(x, \xi) = \mu^2 \sum_{j,k} g^{jk} p_j(x, \xi) p_k(x, \xi),$$

$$p_j(x, \xi) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\xi_j - V_j);$$

Classes $\mathcal{F}^{l,\sigma}$ are introduced in [Ivr6]. To finish preliminary remarks let us notice that the following statement holds

Proposition 2.1. ⁴ *Let $f \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $f = 1$ in $B(0, C_0)$ with large enough constant C_0 . Let $T \geq h^{1-\delta}$. Then under condition (2.1) with large enough constant $C = C_s$*

$$(2.7) \quad |F_{t \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau} \left(1 - f(p_1(x, \xi), p_2(x, \xi), \dots, p_d(x, \xi)) \right)^w \chi_T(t) u| \leq Ch^s$$

$$\forall x, y \in B(0, \frac{1}{2}) \quad \forall \tau \leq c.$$

One can see easily that symbol $f(p_1(x, \xi), p_2(x, \xi), \dots, p_d(x, \xi))$ is quantizable under condition (2.1) and the proof of proposition 2.1 is rather obvious.

2.2 Analysis in the exterior zone

Proposition 2.2. ⁵ *Let $\mu \leq \epsilon h^{-1} |\log h|^{-1}$ ⁶ and let*

$$(2.8) \quad M \geq \sup_{\sum_{j,k} g^{jk} \xi_j \xi_k + V = 0} 2 \sum_k g^{jk} \xi_k + \epsilon$$

⁴Microlocal boundaries for P_j . Compare with proposition 5.1 of [Ivr6].

⁵Finite speed of propagation with respect to x ; cf. Proposition 2.1 [Ivr6] and Proposition 1.1 [Ivr7].

⁶Lower bound condition is not needed in this statement as well as non-degeneracy conditions.

with arbitrarily small constant $\epsilon > 0$.

Let ϕ_1 be supported in $B(0, 1)$, $\phi_2 = 1$ in $B(0, 2)$, χ be supported in $[-1, 1]$ ⁷. Finally, let $\bar{T}_0 = Ch|\log h| \leq T \leq T'_1 = \epsilon_0$.

Then

$$(2.9) \quad |F_{t \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau} \bar{\chi}_T(t) (1 - \phi_{2,MT}(x - \bar{x})) \phi_{1,MT}(y - \bar{x}) u(x, y, t)| \leq Ch^s \quad \forall x, y \quad \forall \tau \leq \epsilon_1$$

where here and below $\epsilon_1 > 0$ is a small enough constant.

Proposition 2.3.⁸ Let $\mu \leq \epsilon h^{\delta-1}$ and let

$$(2.10) \quad \bar{T}_0 = Ch\epsilon^{-1} |\log h| \leq T \leq T'_1 = \epsilon_0.$$

Then

$$(2.11) \quad |F_{t \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau} \bar{\chi}_T(t) (1 - \phi_{2,MT}(hD_x''' - \bar{\xi}''')) \phi_{1,MT}(hD_y''' + \bar{\xi}''') \psi_x \psi_y u(x, y, t)| \leq Ch^s \quad \forall x, y \quad \forall \tau \leq \epsilon_1$$

where here and below ψ is an admissible function supported in $B(0, \frac{1}{2})$ and $\psi_x = \psi(x)$, $\psi_y = \psi(y)$.

Proposition 2.4.⁹ Let $\mu \leq \epsilon h^{\delta-1}$ and condition (2.10) be fulfilled. Let

$$(2.12) \quad \rho \geq Ch\epsilon^{-1} |\log h| + C\mu^{-1}.$$

Then for

$$(2.13) \quad C(\mu^{-1}h|\log h|)^{\frac{1}{2}} + C\rho^{-2}h|\log h| \leq T \leq \epsilon\rho$$

inequality

$$(2.14) \quad |F_{t \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau} \chi_T(t) \Gamma Q_y \psi_y u(x, y, t)| \leq Ch^s \quad \forall \tau \leq \epsilon_1$$

holds for $Q_y = \phi_{1,MT}(hD_y''' + \bar{\xi}''')$.

⁷I remind that we pick up all such auxiliary functions to be admissible in the sense of [BrIvr].

⁸Finite speed of propagation with respect to P''' ; cf. Proposition 5.2 [Ivr6].

⁹Singularities leave diagonal; cf. proof of Proposition 5.3 [Ivr6].

Now let us pick up

$$(2.15) \quad \varepsilon = C\rho^{-1}h|\log h|.$$

Then any $T \in [\epsilon\mu^{-1}, \epsilon\rho]$ satisfies condition (2.13) as long as

$$(2.16) \quad \rho \geq \bar{\rho}_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} C\mu^{-1} + C(\mu h|\log h|)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

This is a definition of the *exterior zone* and ε is defined by (2.15) there.

Then the contribution of the exterior zone to an approximation error does not exceed

$$(2.17) \quad C \int \left(\frac{h|\log h|}{\rho}\right)^l \left(1 + \frac{\mu h|\log h|}{\rho}\right) |\log h|^{-\sigma} \rho^{q-1} d\rho \times h^{-d}$$

with all integrals here and until the end of the section taken from $\bar{\rho}_1$ to 1, and (2.17) is $O(h^{1-d})$ as either $q \geq 2$, $(l, \sigma) \succeq (1, 1)$ or $q = 1$, $(l, \sigma) \succeq (1, 2)$ (as stated in propositions 1.1(i), 1.2(i)).

On the other hand, Tauberian arguments exactly as in [Ivr6] imply that the semiclassical remainder estimate is

$$(2.18) \quad Ch^{1-d} \int \frac{1}{T_1'} \rho^{q-1} d\rho$$

or $Ch^{1-d} \int \rho^{q-2} d\rho$ which is $O(h^{1-d})$ as $q \geq 2$.

So, we have proven

Proposition 2.5. *As $q \geq 2$, $\varepsilon = Ch|\log h|\rho^{-1}$, $(l, \sigma) = (1, 1)$ contributions of the exterior zone $\{|\xi'''\rangle \geq \bar{\rho}_1\}$ with $\rho \geq \bar{\rho}_1 = C\mu^{-1} + C(\mu h|\log h|)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ to both approximation error and semiclassical remainder estimates are $O(h^{1-d})$.*

2.3 Exterior zone: special analysis for $q = 1$

As $q = 1$ (2.18) with $T_1' = \epsilon\rho$ results in $Ch^{1-d}|\log \mu|$ in and to get rid of $|\log \mu|$ we need increase T_1' . We consider few cases in the increased generality and complexity.

(i) If g^{jk} and F_{jk} are constant it is easy: we can take $T_1' = C\rho|\log \rho|^2$ as in section 5 of [Ivr6] provided $(l, \sigma) \succeq (1, 2)$ and we can consider propagation in an appropriate time direction (in which ξ_d increases); see section 5 of [Ivr6] for details. Namely, let us cover $B(0, 1)$ by balls of radii $\gamma = \rho^{\delta_1}$ (with small exponent $\delta_1 > 0$). In each element one of the following cases holds:

$$(2.19) \quad |\partial_{x_d} V(x, \xi)| \asymp \varrho \geq \bar{\varrho} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} C_0 |\log \rho|^{-2},$$

$$(2.20) \quad |\partial_{x_d} V(x, \xi)| \leq \bar{\varrho}.$$

During propagation the classical trajectory does not leave the initial ball. Furthermore, in case (2.20) $|\frac{d\xi_d}{dt}| = |\partial_{x_d} V|$ does not exceed $\bar{\varrho}$ and $|\xi_d| \geq \frac{1}{2}\rho - \bar{\varrho}|t| \geq \frac{1}{3}\rho$ as $|t| \leq T'_1$.

On the other hand, in case (2.19) $|\frac{d\xi_d}{dt}|$ is larger than ϱ and does not change sign for $|t| \leq T'_1$. Then $|\xi_d| \geq \frac{1}{2}\rho + \varrho|t|$ for $0 \leq \pm t \leq T'_1$ with an appropriate sign.

In both cases x_d shifts away from its initial position and for time t (of the appropriate sign in the case (2.19)) this shift is of magnitude $\rho|t| + \varrho|t|^2$ as $\epsilon\mu^{-1} = \bar{T}_0 \leq \pm t \leq T'_1$ (with an appropriate sign) and we can take a prescribed $T'_1 = \epsilon\rho|\log \rho|^2$ and recover $O(h^{1-d})$ in (2.18).

(ii) Similar arguments work if f_j have constant multiplicities. Really, we can rewrite then symbol as

$$(2.21) \quad a(x, \xi) = \xi_d^2 + \mu^2 \sum_{1 \leq j \leq r} f_j(\eta_{2j-1}^2 + \eta_{2j}^2) + V$$

with η_k being linear combinations of $p_1, \dots, p_{2r}$ (with $\mathcal{F}^{1,2}$ coefficients) such that

$$(2.22) \quad \mu\{\eta_k, \eta_m\} \equiv \Lambda_{km}$$

modulo linear combinations of $\eta_1, \dots, \eta_{2r}$ with $\mathcal{F}^{0,2}$ coefficients where $\Lambda_{km} = 1$ if $k = 2j - 1, m = 2j$ for some j , $\Lambda_{km} = -1$ if $k = 2j, m = 2j - 1$ for some j , $\Lambda_{km} = 0$ otherwise.

Then derivative of $\mu^2(\eta_{2j-1} + i\eta_{2j})(\eta_{2k-1} - i\eta_{2k})$ along classical trajectories

$$(2.23) \quad |\mu^2\{a, (\eta_{2j-1} + i\eta_{2j})(\eta_{2k-1} - i\eta_{2k})\}| \leq M(1 + \mu|f_j - f_k|) \quad \forall j, k$$

is bounded as $f_j = f_k$ and during time T its variation does not exceed CT which is way less than $\epsilon\bar{\varrho}$. This could be justified on the quantum level as well because one can quantize symbol $f\left(\bar{\varrho}^{-1}((\eta_{2j-1} + i\eta_{2j})(\eta_{2k-1} - i\eta_{2k}) - \lambda)\right)$ with function f supported in $[-c, c]$ and $|\lambda| \leq c$.

Consider now $\{a, \xi_d\}$; modulo $O(\rho)$ it is equal to $-\partial_{x_d} V + \mu^2 \sum_{j,k} \alpha_{jk} \eta_j \eta_k$ with $\mathcal{F}^{0,2}$ coefficients. Then we can find α'_{jk} such that

$$(2.24) \quad \{a, \xi_d - \mu \sum_{j,k} \alpha_{jk} \eta_j \eta_k\} \equiv -\partial_{x_d} V + \mu^2 \sum_{j,k: f_j=f_k} \alpha''_{jk} (\eta_{2j-1} + i\eta_{2j})(\eta_{2k-1} - i\eta_{2k})$$

modulo $O(\bar{\varrho})$: we remove all non-resonant terms but previously we make ρ^δ -mollification of α_{jk} thus making $O(\bar{\varrho})$ error. But then all the above arguments work since correction $\mu \sum_{j,k} \alpha_{jk} \eta_j \eta_k$ does not exceed $C\mu^{-1} \leq \epsilon\rho$. The role of $-\partial_{x_d} V$ is played now by right-hand expression of (2.24).

(iii) Consider now the general case. First of all let us make again $\gamma = \rho^{\delta_1}$ -covering and consider one element. Then the symbol could be rewritten in the form

$$(2.25) \quad a(x, \xi) = \xi_d^2 + \sum_{\mathbf{m}} a_{\mathbf{m}} + V, \quad a_{\mathbf{m}} = \mu^2 \sum_{j,k \in \mathbf{m}} a_{jk} (\eta_{2j-1} - i\eta_{2j}) (\eta_{2k-1} + i\eta_{2k})$$

with Hermitean matrices $a_{\mathbf{m}} = (a_{jk})_{j,k \in \mathbf{m}}$ whose eigenvalues are $f_j(x)$, f_j and f_k differ by less than ϵ (more than 2ϵ) as j, k belong to the same group $\mathbf{m}$ (different groups, respectively).

Consider traceless matrices $b_{\mathbf{m}} = a_{\mathbf{m}} - \frac{1}{(\#\mathbf{m})} \text{tr } a_{\mathbf{m}} \cdot I_{\mathbf{m}}$ with corresponding unit matrices $I_{\mathbf{m}}$ and matrices $c_{\mathbf{m}} = \partial_{x_1} b_{\mathbf{m}}$ calculated at some point of this element. Without any loss of the generality one can assume that each $c_{\mathbf{m}}$ is a diagonal matrix and with eigenvalues classified into groups: λ_j and λ_k differ less than $\epsilon \bar{\rho}$ (more than $2\epsilon \bar{\rho}$) as j, k belong to the same subgroup $\mathbf{n} \subset \mathbf{m}$ (different subgroups, respectively). Then one can cover each element of partition by $\gamma_1 = \rho^{\delta_1 + \delta_2}$ subelements of two kinds:

(a) The total measure of this type elements (of all elements together) does not exceed $C\bar{\rho}$ and thus their total contribution to the remainder estimate does not exceed $Ch^{1-d} |\log \rho|^{-2}$ which after integration over $\frac{d\rho}{\rho}$ gives $O(h^{1-d})$.

(b) With f_j, f_k different by more than γ_1 as j, k belonging to different subgroups. Then we can rewrite (2.25) with $\mathbf{n}$ (which indicates finer partition) instead of $\mathbf{m}$ and to prove that $|\{a, a_{\mathbf{n}}\}| \leq C\gamma^{-\delta_3}$ where δ_3 could be made arbitrarily small (by taking all the previous exponents small). Then $a_{\mathbf{n}}$ are conserved modulo $O(\bar{\rho})$ in the classical evolution.

Moreover, we can make even finer subpartition depending on subelement such that $|f_j - f_k| \leq C\bar{\rho}$ if i, j belong to the same element of it.

But then $f_{\mathbf{n}} \mu^2 \sum_{j \in \mathbf{n}} (\eta_{2j-1}^2 + \eta_{2j}^2)$ are conserved modulo $O(\bar{\rho})$ and then it is also true for $a_{\mathbf{n}}$ and $a_{\mathbf{m}}$ as well and also

$$\{a, \xi_d - \mu \sum_{j,k} \alpha_{jk} \eta_j \eta_k\} \equiv \sum_j \lambda_j (\eta_{2j-1}^2 + \eta_{2j}^2) \mod O(\bar{\rho}).$$

But then arguments of (i),(ii) work and the total contribution of elements of type (b) does not exceed $Ch^{1-d} |\log \rho|^{-2}$ as well and after integration over $\frac{d\rho}{\rho}$ we get $O(h^{1-d})$ again. So

Proposition 2.6. *As $q = 1$, $\varepsilon = Ch |\log h| \rho^{-1}$, $(l, \sigma) = (1, 2)$ contributions of the exterior zone $\{|\xi'''| \geq \bar{\rho}_1\}$ with $\rho \geq \bar{\rho}_1 = C\mu^{-1} + C(\mu h |\log h|)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ to both approximation error and semiclassical remainder estimates are $O(h^{1-d})$.*

Similar arguments were applied in [Ivr5] to study propagation near the boundary.

2.4 Main theorems. I

On the other hand, the standard estimate in the complimentary zone $\{|\xi'''\} \leq \bar{\rho}_1\}$ brings remainder estimate $Ch^{1-d} \times \mu \bar{\rho}_1^q \asymp Ch^{1-d} \times \mu(\mu h |\log h|)^{\frac{q}{2}} + Ch^{1-d} \mu^{1-q}$.

Therefore we have

Proposition 2.7. *Let conditions (0.4) – (0.7) be fulfilled and let either $q \geq 2$, $(l, \sigma) \succeq (1, 1)$ or $q = 1$, $(l, \sigma) \succeq (1, 2)$. Then*

(i) *For $\mu \leq \epsilon h^{\delta-1}$ estimate*

$$(2.26) \quad \mathcal{R}_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} |\Gamma(e\psi)(\tau) - h^{-1} \int_{-\infty}^{\tau} F_{t \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau'} \bar{\chi}_T(t) \Gamma(u\psi)| \leq Ch^{1-d} + C\mu(\mu h |\log h|)^{\frac{q}{2}} h^{1-d} \quad \forall \tau : |\tau| \leq \epsilon_1$$

holds with $T = \bar{T} = \epsilon \mu^{-1}$.

(ii) *Furthermore, this estimate holds with any $T \in [T_0, \bar{T}]$ with $T_0 = Ch |\log h|$.*

Statement (ii) follows from the fact that in the standard settings $F_{t \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau} \chi_T(t) \Gamma(u\psi)$ is negligible for indicated T and τ (I remind that χ is supported in $[-1, -\frac{1}{2}] \cup [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$) and

$$(2.27) \quad h^{-1} \int_{-\infty}^{\tau} F_{t \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau'} \chi_T(t) \Gamma(u\psi) d\tau' = iT^{-1} F_{t \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau} \check{\chi}_T(t) \Gamma(u\psi)$$

with $\check{\chi}(t) = t^{-1} \chi(t)$.

Proposition 2.7 implies Theorem 0.3 after we prove (by successive approximations or reference to standard results rescaled) that

$$(2.28) \quad h^{-1} \int_{-\infty}^{\tau} F_{t \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau'} \bar{\chi}_T(t) \Gamma(u\psi) d\tau$$

equals $\int \mathcal{E}^{\text{MW}}(x, \tau) \psi(x) dx$ modulo remainder estimate which is easy. I leave it to the reader.

On the other hand, this approach is valuable even if theorem 0.3 is not our target because μ is pretty large. Namely, from the analysis of two previous subsections follows

Proposition 2.8. *Let conditions (0.4) – (0.7) be fulfilled. Then*

(i) *for $\bar{\mu}_q \leq \mu \leq \epsilon h^{-1} |\log h|^{-1}$ with small enough constant ϵ estimate*

$$(2.29) \quad \mathcal{R}_{1Q} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} |\Gamma(Qe\psi)(\tau) - h^{-1} \int_{-\infty}^{\tau} F_{t \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau'} Q \bar{\chi}_T(t) \Gamma(u\psi)| \leq \begin{cases} Ch^{1-d} & q \geq 2, \\ Ch^{1-d} |\log h| & q = 1 \end{cases}$$

holds as $|\tau| \leq \epsilon_1$ where $Q = I - f(hD''')$ with admissible function f supported in $\{|\xi''| \leq 2\bar{\rho}_1\}$ and equal 1 in $\{|\xi''| \leq \bar{\rho}_1\}$ with $\bar{\rho}_1 = C(\mu^{-1}h|\log h|)^{\frac{1}{2}}$, $T = \epsilon_1\mu^{-1}$.

(ii) Further, if $q = 1$, $(l, \sigma) \succeq (1, 2)$ and either

(a) $\mu \leq h^{\delta-1}$, or

(b) f_j have constant multiplicities, or

(c) microhyperbolicity condition 0.1 is fulfilled on level 0

then $\mathcal{R}_{1Q} \leq Ch^{1-d}$ as $|\tau| \leq \epsilon_1$.

We will use this proposition to handle exterior zone in the case of the intermediate magnetic field.

2.5 Main theorems. II

Further, applying technique of subsection 7.2 of [Ivr6] and of proposition 1.4 of [Ivr7] we can prove easily

Proposition 2.9. *Let $\bar{\mu}_q \leq \mu \leq \epsilon h^{-1}|\log h|^{-1}$ and microhyperbolicity condition 0.1 be fulfilled. Then for $C\epsilon^{-1}h|\log h| \leq T \leq T'_1 = \epsilon_1$ estimate (2.14) holds.*

Selecting in the exterior zone $\{\rho \geq \bar{\rho}_1\}$

$$(2.30) \quad \varepsilon = C\mu h|\log h| \left(\frac{\bar{\rho}_1}{\rho}\right)^s + C\rho^{-1}h|\log h|$$

and combining with proposition 2.4 we get then that for Q with the symbol supported in the exterior zone estimate (2.14) holds for $\epsilon\mu^{-1} \leq T \leq \epsilon_1$.

In the complimentary zone $\{\rho \leq \bar{\rho}_1\}$ we can select $\varepsilon = C\mu h|\log h|$ (as $\mu \geq h^{-\frac{1}{3}}|\log h|^{-\frac{1}{3}}$) and then for Q with the symbol supported there estimate (2.14) also holds for $\epsilon\mu^{-1} \leq T \leq T'_1 = \epsilon_1$. Thus we arrive to

Proposition 2.10. *Let $h^{-\frac{1}{3}}|\log h|^{-\frac{1}{3}} \leq \mu \leq \epsilon h^{-1}|\log h|^{-1}$ and microhyperbolicity condition 0.1 be fulfilled. Let ε be defined by (2.30). Then estimate (2.14) holds with $Q = I$ and any $T \in [\bar{T}_0, T'_1]$, $\bar{T}_0 = \epsilon\mu^{-1}$, $T'_1 = \epsilon_1$.*

Combining with the standard results rescaled and applying standard Tauberian technique we arrive to estimate (2.26) again.

On the other hand, an approximation error does not exceed

$$(2.31) \quad C(\mu h|\log h|)^{l+\frac{q}{2}} |\log h|^{-\sigma} h^{-d}$$

as long as $\varepsilon \leq C\mu^{-1}$ (i.e. for $\mu \leq Ch^{-\frac{1}{2}}|\log h|^{-\frac{1}{2}}$).

Further, for $\mu \geq Ch^{-\frac{1}{2}}|\log h|^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ an approximation error does not exceed

$$(2.32) \quad C\mu(\mu h|\log h|)^{1+\bar{l}+\frac{q}{2}}|\log h|^{-\bar{\sigma}}h^{-d} + C(\mu h|\log h|)^{l+\frac{q}{2}}|\log h|^{-\sigma}h^{-d}.$$

However if $\ell_{\perp} = 0$ we can take mollification with $\varepsilon = Ch\rho^{-1}|\log h|$ with respect to all variables x and also an extra mollification with ε defined by (2.30) with respect to x''' ; then mollification error will be given still by (2.31).

This implies Theorem 0.5 after we prove (by successive approximations) that expression (2.29) equals $\int \mathcal{E}^{\text{MW}}(x, 0)\psi(x) dx$ modulo remainder estimate. This easy part of the proof I leave to the reader.

3 Canonical form

3.1 Intermediate magnetic field case

3.1.1 Approximation

We can assume now that

$$(3.1) \quad \bar{\mu}_{1(q)} = C(h|\log h|)^{-\frac{q}{q+2}} \leq \mu \leq \epsilon h^{-1}|\log h|^{-1}$$

(a case of larger μ we'll consider later) and from this section point of view there are two different cases $q = 1$ and $q \geq 2$; under microhyperbolicity condition $q = 1$ falls in the latter as well. Anyway we need to consider zone $\mathcal{Z}_1 = \{|\xi'''| \leq \bar{\rho}_1 = C(\mu h|\log h|)^{\frac{1}{2}}\}$ and in this zone in the general case we already set $\varepsilon = C(\mu^{-1}h|\log h|)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. However we reset it to a far larger value $\varepsilon = C\mu^{-1}$ thus defining

$$(3.2) \quad \varepsilon = \begin{cases} C\mu^{-1}\left(\frac{\bar{\rho}_1}{\rho}\right)^s + C\rho^{-1}h|\log h| & \text{as } \rho \geq \bar{\rho}_1, \\ C\mu^{-1} & \text{as } \rho \leq \bar{\rho}_1 \end{cases}$$

with a possible increase later.

For $q \geq 2$, $\mu \geq \bar{\mu}_2 = h^{-\frac{1}{2}}|\log h|^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ (and thus $\mu^{-l}|\log h|^{-\sigma} \leq \mu h$ even as $(l, \sigma) = (1, 1)$) this will bring an approximation error not exceeding

$$C\mu^r h^{-r}(\mu h|\log h|)^{\frac{q}{2}-1}\mu^{-l}|\log h|^{-\sigma} \times (\mu h)^{1-r}|\log h|$$

where the first factor estimates an error in each term in the sum defining $\mathcal{E}^{\text{MW}}$ and the second factor estimates the number of the terms effected; the result is $O(h^{1-d})$ for sure.

As $q = 1$ let assume that¹⁰

$$(3.3) \quad \bar{\rho}_2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\mu^{-l} |\log h|^{-\sigma})^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \rho_1^* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\mu h)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Consider strip $\{\rho \leq |\xi'''| \leq 2\rho\}$ with $\bar{\rho}_2 \leq \rho \leq \bar{\rho}_1$ where an approximation error can be estimated similarly by

$$Ch^{-d} \rho \bar{\rho}_2^2 + C\mu h^{1-d} \rho^{-1} \bar{\rho}_2^2$$

and after summation over ρ we get that the contribution of of zone $\{\bar{\rho}_2 \leq |\xi'''| \leq \bar{\rho}_1\}$ to an error does not exceed

$$(3.4) \quad Ch^{-d} (\mu h |\log h|)^{\frac{1}{2}} \mu^{-l} |\log h|^{-\sigma} + Ch^{1-d} \mu^{1-\frac{l}{2}} |\log h|^{-\frac{\sigma}{2}}.$$

In the zone $\{|\xi'''| \leq C\bar{\rho}_2\}$ no more than $C(\mu h)^{1-r}$ terms in the sum defining $\mathcal{E}^{\text{MW}}$ are affected and an error in each does not exceed $C\mu^r h^{-r} \bar{\rho}_2$; this brings an approximation error estimate $C\mu h^{1-d} \bar{\rho}_2$ which is the exactly the second term in (3.4).

Note that (3.4) is $O(h^{1-d})$ for all $\mu \geq Ch^{-\frac{1}{3}} |\log h|^{-\frac{1}{3}}$ iff $(l, \sigma) \succeq (2, 1)$.

On the other hand, if $q = 1$ and microhyperbolicity condition 0.1 is fulfilled an the approximation error does not exceed

$$(3.5) \quad Ch^{-d} (\mu h |\log h|)^{\frac{1}{2}} \mu^{-l} |\log h|^{-\sigma}$$

and it should be weighted against theorem 0.5; so in this case for $\mu \leq \bar{\mu}_2 = Ch^{-\frac{1}{2}} |\log h|^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ we use theorem 0.5 and for $\mu \geq \bar{\mu}_2$ we will use the intermediate magnetic field construction; an approximation error estimate in both cases is $O(h^{1-d})$ for all corresponding μ iff $(l, \sigma) \succeq (\frac{3}{2}, 1)$.

Proposition 3.1. *Let ε be defined by (3.2). Then*

- (i) *As $q \geq 2$, $(l, \sigma) \succeq (1, 1)$ and $\mu \geq h^{-\frac{1}{2}} |\log h|^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ a mollification error is $O(h^{1-d})$;*
- (ii) *As $q = 1$, $(l, \sigma) \succeq (1, 2)$, $\mu \geq h^{-\frac{1}{3}} |\log h|^{-\frac{1}{3}}$ and (3.3) is fulfilled a mollification error does not exceed (3.4);*
- (ii) *As $q = 1$, $(l, \sigma) \succeq (1, 2)$, $\mu \geq h^{-\frac{1}{2}} |\log h|^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ and microhyperbolicity condition 0.1 is fulfilled a mollification error does not exceed (3.5).*

¹⁰This is not necessarily true as $q = 1$; however without this assumption no improvement of the previous section results is possible.

3.1.2 Reduction. Main part

So we start from operator

$$(3.6) \quad A = \sum_{1 \leq j, k \leq d} P_j^* g^{jk} P_k + V, \quad P_j = hD_j - \mu V_j,$$

$$(3.7) \quad [P_j, P_k] = i\mu h F_{jk},$$

$$(3.8) \quad F_{jk} = 0 \quad \text{as } j \geq 2r + 1 \text{ or } k \geq 2r + 1; \text{ rank}(F_{jk})_{j,k=1,\dots,2r} = 2r,$$

and we can assume without any loss of the generality at some point $\bar{x}$ matrix (F_{jk}) is in the canonical form; namely

$$F_{jk}(\bar{x}) = \begin{cases} f_j & \text{as } j = 1, 3, \dots, 2r - 1, \quad k = j + 1, \\ -f_j & \text{as } j = 2, 4, \dots, 2r, \quad k = j - 1. \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Without any loss of the generality we can assume that in its vicinity

$$(3.9) \quad F_{jk} = 0 \neq 0 \implies j \leq 2r, \quad k \leq 2r \text{ and } \exists \mathfrak{m} \in \mathfrak{M} : j, k \in \mathfrak{m}.$$

Then following [Ivr6, Ivr7] we can prove

Proposition 3.2. *Let*

$$(3.10) \quad \mathcal{L} = \mu^2 \left(\sum_{j,k \leq d} \beta^{jk} p_j p_k \right)^w$$

with $\beta^{jk} = \beta^{kj} \in \mathcal{F}^{\bar{l}, \bar{\sigma}}$. Then modulo operators with symbols belonging to $\mu^{-2} \mathcal{F}^{\bar{l}-1, \bar{\sigma}}$

$$(3.11) \quad e^{\frac{i}{2}\mu^{-1}h^{-1}t\mathcal{L}}(p_j)^w e^{-\frac{i}{2}\mu^{-1}h^{-1}t\mathcal{L}} \equiv \left(\sum_k (e^{\Lambda t})_j^k p_k \right)^w$$

with matrix $\Lambda = (\Lambda_{jk})_{j,k} = (F_{jp})(\beta^{pk})$.

One can see easily that due to (0.4)

$$e^{\Lambda t} = \begin{pmatrix} e^{\Lambda' t} & \int_0^t e^{\Lambda' t'} \Lambda'' dt' \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix}$$

with $\Lambda' = (\Lambda_{jk})_{j,k \leq 2r}$, $\Lambda'' = (\Lambda_{jk})_{j \leq 2r, k \geq 2r+1}$. It provides us with the first step of the reduction:

Step 1. Applying transformation $\exp(\frac{i}{2}\mu^{-1}h^{-1}\mathcal{L})$ with $\mathcal{L}$ defined by (3.10) with appropriate coefficients β^{jk} we can transform operator A to the block form

$$(3.12) \quad \mu^2 \sum_{j,k \leq r} \zeta_j^{\dagger w} a^{jk w} \zeta_k^w + \mu^2 \sum_{j,k \geq 2r+1} p_j^w a^{jk w} p_k^w + a_0^w + \frac{1}{2}(B + B^*),$$

$$(3.13) \quad B = \left(\mu^2 \sum_{j,k,m} b^{jkm} p_j p_k p_m + \sum_j b^j p_j \right)^w$$

$$(3.14) \quad \zeta_j = p_j + ip_{j+r}; \quad a^{jk} \neq 0 \implies \exists \mathfrak{m} : j, k \in \mathfrak{m}$$

where I remind that $\mathfrak{M}$ is the resonance partition at point $\bar{x}$.

Here and below $a^{jk} \in \mathcal{F}^{\bar{l}, \bar{\sigma}}$, $a_0 \in \mathcal{F}^{l, \sigma}$, $b^{jkl} \in \mathcal{F}^{\bar{l}-1, \bar{\sigma}}$, $b^j \in \mathcal{F}^{l-1, \sigma}$ and while $a^{jk} = a^{jk}(x)$ we have $b^{jkl} = b^{jkl}(x, \mu^{-1}\xi)$, $b^j = b^j(x, \mu^{-1}\xi)$ and c^w means h - rather than $\mu^{-1}h$ -quantization of symbol c .

Step 2. Applying an appropriate gauge transformation we can achieve

$$(3.15) \quad V_k = 0 \text{ unless } k = r+1, \dots, 2r \text{ and } V_k = V_k(x_1, \dots, x_{2r}) \text{ for } k = r+1, \dots, 2r.$$

where condition (0.6) provides $C^{\bar{l}+1, \bar{\sigma}}$ -regularity of new V_k . This is the only reason for this condition. Then

$$(3.16) \quad p_j = 0 \quad \forall j = r+1, \dots, 2r \iff x_j = \lambda_j(x'', \xi') \quad \forall j = 1, \dots, r$$

with $x' = (x_1, \dots, x_r)$, $\xi' = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_r)$, $x'' = (x_{r+1}, \dots, x_{2r})$, $\xi'' = (\xi_{r+1}, \dots, \xi_{2r})$, $\lambda_j \in \mathcal{F}^{\bar{l}+1, \bar{\sigma}}$.

Following [Ivr6, Ivr7] and applying transformation $e^{i\mu^{-1}\mathcal{L}'}$ with $\mathcal{L}' = \sum_{1 \leq j \leq r} \lambda_j^w D_{j+r}$ we can transform operator (3.12) to the form (3.12)-(3.13) but now with

$$(3.17) \quad \begin{aligned} \zeta_j &= \eta_j + i\eta_{j+r}, \quad \eta_j = \mu^{-1}\xi_j, \quad \eta_{j+r} = x_j & j &= 1, \dots, r \\ & \eta_j = \mu^{-1}\xi_j & j &= 2r+1, \dots, d. \end{aligned}$$

However in contrast to the previous step of the reduction now

$$a^{jk} = a^{jk}(x'', \mu^{-1}\xi''; x'''), \quad a_0 = a_0(x'', \mu^{-1}\xi''; x''')$$

rather than $a^{jk} = a^{jk}(x)$, $a_0 = a_0(x)$.

Remark 3.3. (i) One can see easily that if f_j have constant multiplicities, operator can be reduced on Step 1 to the form

$$(3.18) \quad \mu^2 \sum_{j \leq r} \zeta_j^{\dagger w} f_j^w \zeta_j^w + \mu^2 \sum_{j,k \geq 2r+1} p_j^w a^{jk w} p_k^w + a_0^w + \frac{1}{2}(B + B^*)$$

and this form will be preserved after Step 2.

(ii) One can see easily that if $q = 1$ then after Step 2 by means of transformation $e^{ih^{-1}\mathcal{L}''}$ with $\mathcal{L}'' = \frac{1}{2}(hD_d k^w + k^w hD_d)$, $k = k(x'', x_d, \mu^{-1}\xi'')$ one can reduce operator to the same form (3.12) but with $a^{dd} = 1$.

(iii) In the general case we can achieve $a^{jk} = \delta_{jk}$ for $j, k = 2r + 1, \dots, d$ only assuming that g^{jk} , F_{jk} are constant.

3.1.3 Reduction. Junior terms

I remind that junior terms are of the form $\frac{1}{2}(B + B^*)$ with B defined by (3.13) with $b^{jkm} = b^{jkm}(x, \mu^{-1}\xi)$, $b^j = b^j(x, \mu^{-1}\xi)$.

Remark 3.4. As $(1, 1) \preceq (l, \sigma) \preceq (2, 0)$ we can rewrite B in the same form but with

$$(3.19) \quad b^{jkm} = b^{jkm}(x'', \mu^{-1}\xi''; x'''), \quad b^j = b^j(x'', \mu^{-1}\xi''; x''')$$

modulo operator B' with the symbol belonging to $\mu^{-l}|\log \mu|^{-\sigma}\mathcal{F}^{0,0}$. Our reduction is done modulo operators of this type.

Then applying operator $e^{i\mu^{-2}h^{-1}\mathcal{L}_1}$ with

$$(3.20) \quad \mathcal{L}_1 = \left(\sum_{\alpha: 1 \leq |\alpha| \leq 3} \beta^{(\alpha)} \mu^{|\alpha|} \eta^\alpha \right)^w,$$

$\eta^\alpha = \eta_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots \eta_d^{\alpha_d}$, one can reduce operator to the same form (3.12) with

$$(3.21) \quad B \equiv \mu^2 \left(\sum_{j,k,m \leq r} b^{jkm} \zeta_j^\dagger \zeta_k \zeta_m + \sum_{j,k \leq r, m \geq 2r+1} b^{jkm} \eta_m \zeta_j^\dagger \zeta_k + \sum_{j,k,m \geq 2r+1} b^{jkm} \eta_m \eta_j \eta_k \right)^w + \left(\sum_{j \geq 2r+1} b^j \eta_j \right)^w.$$

Here in the first term $b^{jkm} = 0$ unless $|f_j - f_k - f_m| \leq \epsilon$ and in the second term $b^{jkm} = 0$ unless $|f_j - f_k| \leq \epsilon$ (so there are the third and second order resonances respectively). Further, $b^{jkm} = 0$ always for constant g^{jk} , F_{jk} .

Also, in (3.20) $\beta^{(\alpha)}$ belongs to $C^{\bar{l}-1, \sigma}$, $C^{l-1, \sigma}$ as $|\alpha| \geq 2$, $|\alpha| = 1$ respectively; also $b^{jkm} \in C^{\bar{l}-1, \sigma}$, $b^j \in C^{l-1, \sigma}$.

Remark 3.5. (i) In the intermediate magnetic field case $|\eta_j| \leq C\mu^{-1}$ in the microlocal sense (on the energy levels below c) and therefore junior terms are of magnitude μ^{-1} and

skipping them we would arrive to an approximation error $Ch^{-d}(\mu h|\log h|)^{\frac{d}{2}}\mu^{-1}$ (as either $q \geq 2$ or $q = 1$ and microhyperbolicity condition holds) which is $O(h^{1-d})$ as $q \geq 3$ and $O(h^{1-d}|\log h|)$ as $q = 2$. So, in the case of an intermediate magnetic field only for $q = 1, 2$ we will need to take junior terms into account at all. This will be a minor annoyance for $q = 2$ but a major obstacle for $q = 1$, when without microhyperbolicity condition this error would be $O(h^{-d}(\mu h|\log h|)^{\frac{1}{2}}\mu^{-1} + \mu^{\frac{1}{2}}h^{1-d})$ but even with the microhyperbolicity these terms cannot be simply ignored.

(ii) Actually, not all of these terms are equally bad: terms containing factor(s) η_m with $2r + 1 \leq m \leq d$ are of magnitude $O(\mu^{-1}|\xi''|)$ and can be simply ignored as $q = 2$ but even as $q = 1$ they are minor annoyances. Only first term in (3.21) are really important.

(iii) One can see easily that if $q = 1$ and f_j have constant multiplicities, then by means of transformation $e^{i\mu^{-1}h^{-1}\mathcal{L}'_1}$ with

$$\mathcal{L}'_1 = \mu^2 \left(\sum_{\mathbf{m}} \sum_{j,k \in \mathbf{m}} c^{jk} \zeta_j^\dagger \zeta_k + c_0 \eta_d^2 \right)^w + c_1^w$$

with $c^{jk} = c^{jk}(x'', x_d, \mu^{-1}\xi'')$, $c_j = c_j(x'', x_d, \mu^{-1}\xi'')$ one can remove from B all terms containing factor η_d thus arriving to

$$(3.22) \quad B \equiv \mu^2 \left(\sum_{j,k,m \leq r} b^{jkm} \zeta_j^\dagger \zeta_k \zeta_m \right)^w.$$

So, we constructed operator $\mathcal{T}$ with the properties described below:

Proposition 3.6. *Let $(\bar{l}, \bar{\sigma}) = (2, 1)$, $(1, 1) \preceq (l, \sigma) \preceq (2, 0)$. Then there exists an operator $\mathcal{T}$ such that*

$$(3.23) \quad \mathcal{T}^* \mathcal{T} \bar{Q} \bar{\psi} \equiv \bar{Q} \bar{\psi},$$

$$(3.24) \quad \mathcal{T}^* Q_1 \mathcal{T} (I - \bar{Q}) \bar{\psi} \equiv 0,$$

$$(3.25) \quad \mathcal{T}^* (I - Q_2) \mathcal{T} \bar{Q} \bar{\psi} \equiv 0,$$

$$(3.26) \quad \mathcal{T}^* \mathcal{A} \mathcal{T} \bar{Q} \bar{\psi} \simeq \mathcal{A} \bar{Q} \bar{\psi}, \quad \text{mod } \mu^{-l} |\log h|^{-\sigma} (\mathcal{F}^{0,0})^w$$

as $\bar{\psi} \in C_0^\infty(B(0, 1))$, $\bar{Q} = \bar{Q}(hD''')$ has a symbol which is supported in $\{|\xi''| \leq 2C\bar{\rho}_1\}$ and equal to 1 in $\{|\xi''| \leq 2C\bar{\rho}_1\}$, Q_1 and Q_2 are the same type operators but with symbols which are supported in $\{|\xi''| \leq 2\bar{\rho}_1\}$ and $\{|\xi''| \leq 2C^2\bar{\rho}_1\}$ and equal to 1 in $\{|\xi''| \leq \bar{\rho}_1\}$ and $\{|\xi''| \leq C^2\bar{\rho}_1\}$ respectively with large enough constant C , $\mathcal{A}$ is the reduced operator (3.12), (3.21).

As $q = 1$ and f_j have constant multiplicities, operator $\mathcal{A}$ is given by (3.12), (3.22).

Remark 3.7. Note that while (3.23)-(3.25) hold modulo negligible operator, (3.26) is satisfied modulo $\mu^{-1}h$ -pdos with symbols of $\mu^{-l}|\log h|^{-\sigma}\mathcal{F}^{0,0}$, and to emphasize the difference I use “ $\simeq$ ” instead of “ $\equiv$ ”.

In contrast to almost all paper in propositions 3.6, 3.8 b^w means $\mu^{-1}h$ -quantization of symbol b .

We also need the following properties of operator constructed above:

Proposition 3.8. *Furthermore the constructed operator has the following properties: For functions $\bar{\psi} = 1$ in $B(0, \frac{3}{4})$ and $\psi \in C_0^\infty(B(0, \frac{1}{2}))$*

$$(3.27) \quad \psi \bar{Q} \bar{\psi} \equiv T^* \tilde{\psi}^w T \bar{Q} \bar{\psi},$$

$$(3.28) \quad \tilde{\psi} \simeq \psi_0(x'', x''', \xi'') + \sum_{1 \leq j \leq d} \psi_j(x'', x''', \xi'') \eta_j \quad \text{mod } \mu^{-l}|\log h|^{-\sigma}\mathcal{F}^{0,0}$$

and for operator $Q = Q^w(hD''')$ as above

$$(3.29) \quad T^* Q T \bar{\psi} \simeq (Q(f(x, \xi)))^w \bar{\psi} \quad \text{mod } \mu^{-l}|\log h|^{-\sigma}(\mathcal{F}^{0,0})^w,$$

$$(3.30) \quad f(x, \xi) \simeq \xi''' - \sum_{1 \leq j \leq 2r} \kappa_j \eta_j - \mu^{-1} \kappa_0 \quad \text{mod } \mu^{-l}|\log h|^{-\sigma}\mathcal{F}^{0,0}$$

with coefficients $\kappa_j = \kappa_j(x'', x''', \mu^{-1}\xi'')$ and all estimates holding for $|\eta_j| \leq C\mu^{-1}$, $\psi_j, \alpha_j \in \mathcal{F}^{l-1, \sigma}$.

Proof. We prove more difficult (3.29), (3.30).

(i) On Step 1 of the main part reduction we considered operator $e^{\frac{i}{2}\mu^{-1}h^{-1}t\mathcal{L}}$ with the corresponding symplectomorphism which is equivalent to the map $f_t : (x, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_d) \rightarrow (x, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_d)$ which is of $\mathcal{F}^{l, \sigma}$ class. Let $Q_t = (Q(f_t))^w$; then the principal symbol of operator

$$(3.31) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial t} Q_t + \frac{i}{2} \mu^{-1} h^{-1} [\mathcal{L}, Q_t]$$

vanishes and then as long as $(\bar{l}, \bar{\sigma}) \succeq (2, 1)$ and $\varepsilon \geq C(\mu^{-1}h|\log h|)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ the norm of this operator does not exceed

$$C\mu^{-1}h^{-1} \times \left(\frac{h}{\rho}\right)^2 \leq C\mu^{-1}h(\mu h|\log h|)^{-1} = C\mu^{-2}|\log h|^{-1}$$

for $\rho \geq C(\mu h|\log h|)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Then the norm of operator

$$(3.32) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \left(e^{-\frac{i}{2}\mu^{-1}h^{-1}t\mathcal{L}} Q_t e^{\frac{i}{2}\mu^{-1}h^{-1}t\mathcal{L}} \right)$$

does not exceed $C\mu^{-2}|\log h|^{-1}$ and then the same is true for operators

$$(3.33) \quad e^{-\frac{i}{2}\mu^{-1}h^{-1}t\mathcal{L}}Q_te^{\frac{i}{2}\mu^{-1}h^{-1}t\mathcal{L}} - Q \quad \text{and} \quad e^{\frac{i}{2}\mu^{-1}h^{-1}t\mathcal{L}}Qe^{-\frac{i}{2}\mu^{-1}h^{-1}t\mathcal{L}} - Q_t.$$

(ii) The same arguments work perfectly on Step 2 of the main part reduction.

(iii) Now consider the junior terms reduction. First of all, there are removable terms $\sum_{1 \leq j \leq 2r} \beta_j \eta_j$ with $\beta_j = \beta_j(x'', \mu^{-1}\xi'')$, $\beta_j \in \mathcal{F}^{l-1, \sigma}$ which are removed by a transformation of the same type as above with $\mathcal{L} = \mu^{-1} \sum_{1 \leq j \leq 2r} \beta'_j \eta_j$ and $\beta'_j = \beta'_j(x'', \mu^1 \xi'')$, $\beta'_j \in \mathcal{F}^{l-1, \sigma}$ as well.

Then the corresponding Hamiltonian map is of class $\mathcal{F}^{l, \sigma}$ and then the principal symbol of operator (3.28) vanishes and the norm of this operator does not exceed

$$C\mu^{2-l}|\log h|^{-\sigma} \times \mu^{-1}h^{-1} \times \left(\left(\frac{h}{\rho} \right)^2 + \mu^{-1}h \left(\frac{h}{\rho} \right) \times \mu^{2-l}|\log h|^{-\sigma} \right) \leq C\mu^{-l}|\log h|^{-\sigma} \times \frac{\mu h}{\rho^2}$$

which is less than $C\mu^{-l}|\log h|^{-\sigma}$ and then the same estimate holds for operators (3.32)-(3.33).

With the removable third and second order terms the construction is the same but simpler since these terms are coming from the principal part which belongs to $\mathcal{F}^{2,1}$ for sure. $\square$

Remark 3.9. In [Ivr6] in the case $d = 3$ we took $\varepsilon = C(\mu^{-1}h|\log h|)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ instead of $C\mu^{-1}$. The above construction would not work. In this case note first that the rescaling $x \mapsto \varepsilon^{-1}(x - \bar{x})$ and taking $\hbar = \mu^{-1}h\varepsilon^{-2} = C^{-1}|\log h|^{-1}$ we will see that the original operator $\bar{\chi}(\hbar D_3/\rho)$ becomes $\bar{\chi}(\hbar D_3)$ and $\mu^{-1}h^{-1}\mathcal{L}$ becomes $\nu\ell(x, \hbar D)$ with $\nu = \mu^{-2}\varepsilon^{-1} = C^{-1}(\mu^3h|\log h|)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \leq \varepsilon_1$ and therefore $e^{i\mu^{-1}h^{-1}\mathcal{L}}$ becomes $\hbar$ -pdo with “analytic” symbol (more precisely its symbol and those of Q satisfy [BrIvr]). Then $e^{-i\mu^{-1}h^{-1}\mathcal{L}}Qe^{i\mu^{-1}h^{-1}\mathcal{L}}$ becomes $\hbar$ -pdo which means that in the original scale it is $\mu^{-1}h$ -pdo with $\mathcal{F}^{0,0}$ symbol supported in $\{|\xi_3| \leq 2C\rho\}$ and equal 1 in $\{|\xi_3| \leq C\rho\}$ with $\rho = \bar{\rho}_1 = C(\mu h|\log h|)^{\frac{1}{2}}$.

3.2 Reduction. Strong and Stronger Magnetic Field

In this case we have

$$(3.34) \quad \mu \geq \varepsilon h^{-1}|\log h|^{-1},$$

$$(3.35) \quad \varepsilon = C(\mu^{-1}h|\log \mu|)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Then construction of subsection 3.1 works on every its step. Now in a microlocal sense $|\eta_j| \leq C(\mu^{-1}h|\log h|)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ (on energy levels below c), and therefore junior terms seem to be

of magnitude $C\mu^2(\mu^{-1}h|\log \mu|)^{\frac{3}{2}}$ and cannot be skipped; even next junior terms are of magnitude $C\mu^2(\mu^{-1}h|\log \mu|)^2$ which is $O(h)$ as $h|\log \mu|^2 \leq C$ only.

In fact, however, as we will see, junior terms will have no impact because a microlocal estimate will be replaced by an operator one $|\eta_j^w| \leq C(\mu^{-1}h)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ which is sufficient to estimate junior terms by Ch as long as $\mu \leq C_0h^{-1}$ (strong and superstrong magnetic field). Further, for $\mu h \geq C_0h^{-1}$ (ultrastrong magnetic field) only the lowest Landau level is important.

4 Estimates.

4.1 Intermediate Zone. I

Note Until subsection 4.9 we assume first that magnetic field is intermediate i.e. condition (3.1) is fulfilled.

Let us consider *intermediate zone*

$$(4.1) \quad \Omega_1 = \{\rho_1^* = C \max(\mu^{-1}, (\mu h)^{\frac{1}{2}}) \leq |\xi'''| \leq \bar{\rho}_1 = (\mu h |\log h|)^{\frac{1}{2}}\}.$$

We split it into strips $\mathcal{Z}_\rho = \{\rho \leq |\xi'''| \leq 2\rho\}$ with ρ in the indicated frames.

Proposition 4.1. *Let condition (3.1) be fulfilled and let $Q = Q^w$ be operator with symbol supported in $\mathcal{Z}_\rho$, and such that*

$$(4.2) \quad |\partial_{x,\xi}^\alpha Q| \leq C\rho^{-|\alpha|}$$

and $\psi \in C_0^\infty(B(0, 1))$.

Let $\chi \in C_0^\infty([-1, -\frac{1}{2}] \cup [\frac{1}{2}, 1])$. Then estimate

$$(4.3) \quad |F_{t \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau} \chi_T(t) \Gamma Q \psi u| \leq Ch^{-d} T \rho^q (\rho^2 + \rho T + \mu^{-1}) \left(\frac{h}{\rho^2 T}\right)^s$$

holds as

$$(4.4) \quad \frac{h}{\rho^2} \leq T \leq \epsilon \rho$$

with arbitrarily large exponent s .

Proof. Proof repeats those of analysis in subsections 8.1, 8.2 of [Ivr6]. First of all, let us make γ -partition with respect to (x'', ξ'', x''') with

$$(4.5) \quad \gamma \geq C\mu^{-1} + C(\mu^{-1}h|\log h|)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

and consider some element $\psi'(x)$ of it supported in $B(\bar{x}, \gamma)$. Let us reduce operator to its canonical form in $B(\bar{x}, 2\gamma)$; with no loss of the generality one can assume that this canonical form is

$$(4.6) \quad \sum_{1 \leq j \leq r} \bar{f}_j (h^2 D_j^2 + \mu^2 x_j^2) + \sum_{2r+1 \leq j \leq d} h^2 \bar{g}^{jk} D_j D_k + \bar{V} + O(\gamma)$$

there where $\bar{f}_j$, $\bar{g}^{jk}$ and $\bar{V}$ are constant (and we can assume that $\bar{g}^{jk} = \delta_{jk}$, $O(\gamma)$ covers variations of f_j , V as well as unremovable terms and we are discussing only $B(\bar{x}, 2\gamma)$).

Let us decompose $(\mathcal{T}u)$ into the sum

$$(4.7) \quad (\mathcal{T}u)(x, y, t) = \sum_{\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Z}^{+r}} u_{\alpha, \beta}(x'', x''', y'', y''', t) \Upsilon_\alpha(x') \Upsilon_\beta(y')$$

with $\Upsilon_\alpha(x') = r^{-\frac{d}{2}} \prod_j v_{\alpha_j}(x_j/\hbar)$, $\hbar = (\mu^{-1}h)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and Hermite functions v_* .

Then modulo $O(\gamma)$ in L^2 -norm operator $\mathcal{A}$ applied to the terms containing $\Upsilon_\alpha(x')$ in this sum becomes

$$(4.8) \quad \bar{\mathcal{A}}_\alpha = \sum_{1 \leq j \leq r} \bar{f}_j (2\alpha_j + 1) \mu h + \sum_{2r+1 \leq j \leq d} h^2 D_j^2 + \bar{V}$$

which is a temporary notation.

We strengthen condition (4.5) assuming that

$$(4.9) \quad \gamma \geq \rho^2 + \mu h + \mu^{-1}.$$

Then we can prove easily that for $Q' = Q\mathcal{T}\psi'\mathcal{T}^*$ the following inequality holds

$$(4.10) \quad |F_{t \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau} \chi_T(t) \Gamma' Q' \psi u_{\alpha, \beta}| \leq C \mu^r h^{-r-q} T \rho^q \gamma^d \times \\ \left(\left(\frac{h}{\rho^2 T} \right)^s + \left(\frac{h}{\rho \gamma} \right)^s + \left(\frac{\mu^{-1} h}{\gamma^2} \right)^s \right) \times \\ \left(\frac{\gamma}{\gamma + |\mu h \sum_j \bar{f}_j (\alpha_j - \bar{\alpha}_j)|} \right)^s \times \left(\frac{\gamma}{\gamma + |\mu h \sum_j \bar{f}_j (\beta_j - \bar{\alpha}_j)|} \right)^s$$

with some $\bar{\alpha} = \bar{\alpha}(\tau) \in \mathbb{Z}^{+r}$ where $\Gamma' v = \int v|_{x''=y'', x'''=y'''} dy'' dy'''$.

Here factor $\mu h^{1-d} \rho^q \gamma^d$ comes as a trace norm of $Q' u_{\alpha, \beta}$; the second factor is the sum of three terms: $\left(\frac{h}{\rho^2 T} \right)^s$ is due to microhyperbolicity with respect to ξ''' and rescaling while terms $\left(\frac{h}{\rho \gamma} \right)^s$ and $\left(\frac{\mu^{-1} h}{\gamma^2} \right)^s$ are operator calculus errors. Finally two last factors in the right-hand expression of (4.10) are due to ellipticity of operator $hD_t - \bar{\mathcal{A}}_\alpha$.

More precisely, let us note that operator $\bar{\mathcal{A}}_\alpha + O(\gamma) - \tau$ is elliptic in this vicinity as long as $\alpha \notin \mathfrak{A} = \{\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}^{+r} : |\sum_j (2\alpha_j + 1)\bar{f}_j \mu h + \bar{V} - \tau| \leq \gamma\}$ and we can express there $u_{\alpha,*}$ with $\alpha \notin \mathfrak{A}$ via $u_{\alpha',*}$ with $\alpha' \in \mathfrak{A}$. Namely, for $\alpha \notin \mathfrak{A}$ we have

$$(4.11) \quad |F_{t \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau} \chi_T(t) Q' u_{\alpha,\beta}| \leq \max_{\alpha' \in \mathfrak{A}} |F_{t \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau} \chi_T(t) Q' u_{\alpha',\beta}| \times \left(\gamma \left(\left| \sum_j (2\alpha_j + 1)\bar{f}_j \mu h + \bar{V} \right| + \gamma \right)^{-1} \right)^s$$

The similar inequality holds for $u_{*,\beta}$ with $\beta \notin \mathfrak{A}$. Finally, for $u_{\alpha,\beta}$ with arbitrary $\alpha, \beta \notin \mathfrak{A}$

$$(4.12) \quad |F_{t \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau} \chi_T(t) Q' u_{\alpha,\beta}| \leq \max_{\alpha', \beta' \in \mathfrak{A}} |F_{t \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau} \chi_T(t) Q' u_{\alpha',\beta'}| \times \left(\gamma \left(\left| \sum_j (2\alpha_j + 1)\bar{f}_j \mu h + \bar{V} \right| + \gamma \right)^{-1} \right)^s \times \left(\gamma \left(\left| \sum_j (2\beta_j + 1)\bar{f}_j \mu h + \bar{V} \right| + \gamma \right)^{-1} \right)^s$$

which in combination with microhyperbolicity arguments justifies (4.10).

Note also that $\#\mathfrak{A} \leq C\gamma(\mu h)^{-r}$. Then (4.10) implies

$$(4.13) \quad |F_{t \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau} \chi_T(t) \Gamma Q' \psi u| \leq C \mu^r h^{-r-q} T \rho^q \gamma^d \times \left(\left(\frac{h}{\rho^2 T} \right)^s + \left(\frac{h}{\rho \gamma} \right)^s + \left(\frac{\mu^{-1} h}{\gamma^2} \right)^s \right) \times \gamma(\mu h)^{-r} = C h^{-d} T \rho^q \gamma^{d+1} \left(\left(\frac{h}{\rho^2 T} \right)^s + \left(\frac{h}{\rho \gamma} \right)^s + \left(\frac{\mu^{-1} h}{\gamma^2} \right)^s \right).$$

Restoring to original Q, ψ (by summation over x -partition) we lose factor γ^d . As exponent s is large enough the optimal value of γ honoring (4.9) is $\gamma = \rho T + \rho^2 + \mu^{-1}$ because for $\rho \geq \mu^{-1}$ (which we assume) $\gamma^2 \geq \mu^{-1} \rho^2 T$.

Then we arrive to estimate (4.3). □

Proposition 4.1 implies immediately estimate

$$(4.14) \quad |F_{t \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau} (\bar{\chi}_T(t) - \bar{\chi}_{\bar{T}_0}(t)) \Gamma Q \psi u| \leq C h^{-d} \mu^{-1} \rho^q (\rho^2 + \mu^{-1}) \times \left(\frac{\mu h}{\rho^2} \right)^s$$

with $\bar{\chi} \in C_0^\infty([-1, 1])$ equal 1 on $[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$, $\bar{T}_0 = \epsilon \mu^{-1}$ as T satisfies (4.4).

In turn (4.14) implies

$$(4.15) \quad |F_{t \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau} \bar{\chi}_T(t) \Gamma Q \psi u| \leq C h^{-d} \mu^{-1} \rho^q (\rho^2 + \mu^{-1}) \times \left(\frac{\mu h}{\rho^2} \right)^s + C h^{1-d} \rho^q$$

where $C\rho^q h^{1-d}$ estimates $|F_{t \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau} \bar{\chi}_{\bar{T}_0}(t) \Gamma Q \psi u|$ due to standard results rescaled.

Therefore Tauberian arguments immediately imply estimate

$$(4.16) \quad \mathcal{R}_{1Q} = |\Gamma(Q\psi e) - h^{-1} \int_{-\infty}^0 \left(F_{t \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau} \bar{\chi}_T(t) \Gamma Q \psi u \right) d\tau| \leq$$

$$CT^{-1} \left(Ch^{-d} \mu^{-1} \rho^q (\rho^2 + \mu^{-1}) \times \left(\frac{\mu h}{\rho^2} \right)^s + Ch^{1-d} \rho^q \right) =$$

$$Ch^{-d} \mu^{-1} \rho^{q-1} (\rho^2 + \mu^{-1}) \times \left(\frac{\mu h}{\rho^2} \right)^s + Ch^{1-d} \rho^{q-1}.$$

Let $q \geq 2$. Integrating the first term in the right-hand expression by $\frac{d\rho}{\rho}$ from $\rho_1^* = C(\mu h)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ to $\bar{\rho}_1$ we get its value as $\rho = \rho_1^*$; one can see easily that the result will be then less than Ch^{1-d} . This procedure applied to the second term gives $O(h^{1-d})$ for sure.

So for $q \geq 2$ in the whole zone $\{\rho_1^* \leq |\xi'''| \leq \bar{\rho}_1\}$ we get a proper remainder estimate

$$(4.17) \quad \mathcal{R}_{2Q} = |\Gamma(Q\psi e) - h^{-1} \int_{-\infty}^0 \sum_{0 \leq n \leq \bar{n}} \left(F_{t \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau} \bar{\chi}_{T_n}(t) \Gamma Q_n \psi u \right) d\tau| \leq Ch^{1-d}$$

as $Q = \sum_{0 \leq n \leq \bar{n}} Q_n$, Q_n operators with the symbols supported in $\{\rho_n \leq |\xi'''| \leq \rho_{n+1}\}$, $\rho_n = 2^n \rho_1^*$, $\rho_{\bar{n}} \asymp \bar{\rho}_1$, and satisfying (4.2), $T_n = \epsilon \rho_n$.

Case $q = 1$ we analyze later. So, we arrive to

Proposition 4.2. *As $q \geq 2$ in frames of proposition 4.1 estimate (4.17) holds for operator $Q = Q^w$ with the symbol supported in $\{\rho_1^* \leq |\xi'''| \leq \bar{\rho}_1\}$ and satisfying (4.2).*

Now let us consider

$$(4.18) \quad h^{-1} \int_{-\infty}^0 \left(F_{t \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau} \chi_T(t) \Gamma Q \psi u \right) d\tau$$

where again Q is an operator with the symbol supported in $\mathcal{Z}_\rho$, $T \in [\bar{T}_0, \epsilon\rho]$, $\rho \in [\rho_1^*, \bar{\rho}_1]$ and I remind $\chi \in C_0^\infty([-1, -\frac{1}{2}] \cup [\frac{1}{2}, 1])$. We can rewrite (4.18) as

$$(4.19) \quad T^{-1} \left(F_{t \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau} \check{\chi}_T(t) \Gamma Q \psi u \right) \Big|_{\tau=0}$$

with $\check{\chi}(t) = it^{-1} \chi(t)$ and due to proposition 4.1 (4.19) does not exceed

$$(4.20) \quad Ch^{-d} \rho^{q+2} \times \left(\frac{h}{T \rho^2} \right)^s.$$

Making a summation with respect to $T \in [\bar{T}_0, \epsilon\rho]$ we get its value at $T = \bar{T}_0$ i.e. $Ch^{-d}\rho^{q+2}(\mu h/\rho^2)^s$. Then after summation with respect to $\rho \in [\rho_1^*, \bar{\rho}_1]$ we get its value at $\rho = \rho_1^*$ i.e. $Ch^{-d}(\mu h)^{\frac{q}{2}+1}$. Estimating roughly contribution of interior zone $\{|\xi'''| \leq C\rho_1^*\}$ by $C\mu h^{1-d}(\rho_1^*)^q$ and estimating contribution of the exterior zone by Ch^{1-d} due to results of section 2 we arrive to estimate

$$(4.21) \quad \mathcal{R}_1 = |\Gamma(\psi e) - h^{-1} \int_{-\infty}^0 \left(F_{t \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau} \bar{\chi}_T(t) \Gamma \psi u \right) d\tau| \leq Ch^{1-d} + C(\mu h)^{\frac{q}{2}+1} h^{-d}$$

with $T = \bar{T}_0$.

On the other hand, due to the standard results rescaled for $q \geq 2$

$$(4.22) \quad |h^{-1} \int_{-\infty}^0 \left(F_{t \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau} \bar{\chi}_T(t) \Gamma \psi u \right) d\tau - \int \mathcal{E}^{\text{MW}}(x, \tau) \psi(x) dx| \leq C(\mu h)^{\frac{q}{2}+1} h^{-d} + Ch^{1-d}$$

as $T = \bar{T}_0$ because with our choice

$$(4.23) \quad \varepsilon = \begin{cases} C\mu^{-1} & \rho \leq \bar{\rho}_1, \\ C\mu^{-1} \left(\frac{\bar{\rho}_1}{\rho} \right)^s + Ch\rho^{-1} |\log h| & \rho \geq \bar{\rho}_1 \end{cases}$$

mollification error does not exceed Ch^{1-d} as well.

Thus we proved

Theorem 4.3. *Let $q \geq 2$ and conditions (0.1) – (0.7) with $(\bar{l}, \bar{\sigma}) = (2, 1)$, $(l, \sigma) = (1, 1)$ and (0.24) be fulfilled. Then*

$$(4.24) \quad \mathcal{R} \leq Ch^{1-d} + Ch^{-d}(\mu h)^{\frac{q}{2}+1};$$

in particular $\mathcal{R} \leq Ch^{1-d}$ as

$$(4.25) \quad \mu \leq \mu_q^* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} Ch^{-\frac{q}{q+2}}.$$

Note that $\mu_2^* = Ch^{-\frac{1}{2}}$, $\mu_3^* = Ch^{-\frac{3}{5}}$ etc.

Now we can assume that

$$(4.26) \quad \mu_q^* \leq \mu \leq \epsilon h^{-1} |\log h|^{-1}.$$

In this case we will use the following corollary of (4.16):

Proposition 4.4. *Let $q \geq 2$ and (4.26) hold and $Q = Q(hD''')$, $Q = Q(\xi''')$ be operator with symbol supported in $\mathcal{Z}_\rho$, $\rho_1^* \leq \rho \leq \bar{\rho}_1$, $\psi \in C_0^\infty(B(0, 1))$. Then*

$$(4.27) \quad \mathcal{R}_{1Q} = |\Gamma(Qe) - h^{-1} \int_{-\infty}^0 \left(F_{t \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau} \bar{\chi}_T(t) \Gamma Q \psi u \right) d\tau| \leq Ch^{1-d} \rho^{q-1}$$

as $T = \epsilon\rho$ and

$$(4.28) \quad \mathcal{R}_{0Q} = |\Gamma(Qe) - h^{-1} \int_{-\infty}^0 \left(F_{t \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau} \bar{\chi}_{\bar{T}_0}(t) \Gamma Q \psi u \right) d\tau| \leq Ch^{1-d} \rho^{q-1} + Ch^{-d} \left(\frac{\mu h}{\rho^2} \right)^s \rho^q.$$

with $T = \epsilon\rho$.

Note that the right-hand expression of (4.27) integrated by $\frac{d\rho}{\rho}$ does not exceed Ch^{1-d} .

4.2 Intermediate Zone. II

Now we can apply the technique of the previous subsection to calculate expression

$$(4.29) \quad \int_{-\infty}^0 \left(F_{t \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau} \phi_T(t) \Gamma Q \psi u \right) d\tau$$

with $\phi = \bar{\chi}$. Let us consider the difference

$$(4.30) \quad \int_{-\infty}^0 \left(F_{t \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau} \phi_T(t) \Gamma Q \psi(u - u') \right) d\tau$$

between (4.29) and the same expression for perturbed operator $A' = A + O(\mu^{-1})$. Then (4.30) is equal to $I_0 + I_1 + \dots + I_{\bar{n}}$ where I_0 is defined by (4.30) with $\phi = \bar{\chi}$ and T replaced by $\bar{T}_0 = \epsilon\mu^{-1}$ and I_n are defined by (4.30) with $\phi = \chi$ and $T = 2^n \bar{T}_0$, $n = 1, \dots, \bar{n}$, $\bar{n} = \lceil T/\bar{T}_0 \rceil$.

Applying arguments of the previous subsection and noting that an operator norm of $(e^{ih^{-1}tA} - e^{ih^{-1}tA'})$ does not exceed $C\mu^{-1}Th^{-1}$ as $|t| \asymp T$, we conclude that I_n does not exceed (4.20) multiplied by $C\mu^{-1}Th^{-1}$ as $n \geq 1$, i.e.

$$(4.31) \quad \left| \int_{-\infty}^0 \left(F_{t \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau} \chi_T(t) \Gamma Q \psi(u - u') \right) d\tau \right| \leq Ch^{-d} \rho^{q+2} \times \left(\frac{h}{\rho^2 T} \right)^s \times \mu^{-1} h^{-1} T.$$

After summation with respect to n we get the same expression with $I = \bar{T}_0$:

$$(4.32) \quad \left| \int_{-\infty}^0 \left(F_{t \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau} (\bar{\chi}_T(t) - \bar{\chi}_{T_0}(t)) \Gamma Q \psi(u - u') \right) d\tau \right| \leq C \mu^{-2} h^{-d-1} \rho^{q+2} \left(\frac{\mu h}{\rho^2} \right)^s.$$

Note that the right-hand expression in (4.32), integrated by $\frac{d\rho}{\rho}$ with ρ from ρ_1^* to 1, does not exceed its value as $\rho = \rho_1^*$ i.e. $C \mu^{-2} h^{-d-1} (\mu h)^{\frac{q+2}{2}} = C h^{1-d} (\mu h)^{\frac{q-2}{2}}$.

Therefore for $q \geq 2$ and Q supported in intermediate zone expression (4.30) is equal to I_0 modulo $O(h^{1-d})$. However, for I_0 we can apply standard theory rescaled and replace it by the difference of the Weyl expressions for A and A' (we will do it in section 5). So far we proved

Proposition 4.5. *In frames of proposition 4.4*

$$(4.33) \quad \left| \Gamma(Q\psi e) - h^{-1} \int_{-\infty}^0 \left(F_{t \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau} \bar{\chi}_T(t) \Gamma Q \psi u^0 - F_{t \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau} \bar{\chi}_{\bar{T}_0}(t) \Gamma Q \psi(u - u^0) \right) d\tau \right| \leq C h^{1-d}$$

where u^0 is a Schwartz kernel of $e^{ih^{-1}tA^0}$, $A^0 = \mathcal{T}^* \mathcal{A}^0 \mathcal{T}$,

$$(4.34) \quad \mathcal{A}^0 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mu^2 \sum_{j,k \leq r} \zeta_j^{\dagger w} a^{jk w} \zeta_k^w + h^2 \sum_{j,k \geq 2r+1} D_j g^{jk w} D_k + a_0^w$$

is the main part of $\mathcal{A}$.

4.3 Interior zone. I

We will return to the intermediate zone (for $q = 1$) later; now let us consider an interior zone

$$(4.35) \quad \Omega_0 = \{|\xi'''| \leq \rho_1^* = (\mu h)^{\frac{1}{2}}\}$$

still assuming that $q \geq 2$ and (4.26) holds.

As $q \geq 2$ one can see easily that the perturbation of the magnitude $O(\mu^{-1})$ there leads to an error $O(\mu^{-1} \rho_1^{*q} h^{-d}) = O(h^{1-d})$ in $\mathcal{E}_Q^{\text{MW}}$.

Thus as $q \geq 2$ instead of $\mathcal{A}$ we can consider in $\Omega_0 \cup \Omega_1$ reduced operator $\mathcal{A}^0$ with coefficients $a^{jk w} = a^{jk}(x'', x''', \mu^{-1} h D'')$, $g^{jk w} = g^{jk}(x'', x''', \mu^{-1} h D'')$, $a_0^w = a_0(x'', x''', \mu^{-1} h D'')$, $\zeta_j^w = \mu^{-1} h D_j + i x_j$ and $a^{jk} = 0$ unless $\exists \mathbf{m} : j, k \in \mathbf{m}$; this will lead to an error $O(h^{1-d})$ in

$\mathcal{R}_{2Q}$. However we provided different arguments for interior zone Ω_0 and intermediate zone Ω_1 to justify this replacement.

If f_j had constant multiplicities we would have even

$$(4.36) \quad \mathcal{A}^0 = \mu^2 \sum_{j \leq r} f_j (h^2 D_j^2 + \mu^2 x_j^2 - \mu h) + h^2 \sum_{j, k \geq 2r+1} D_j^w g^{jkw} D_k^w + a_0^w$$

and decomposing u into (4.7) series we would arrive to the family of operators

$$(4.37) \quad \mathcal{A}_\alpha \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} h^2 \sum_{j, k \geq 2r+1} D_j g^{jkw} D_k + W_\alpha^w, \quad W_\alpha = a_0 + \sum_{j \leq r} 2\alpha \mu h f_j$$

and we would be able to apply without any significant modifications [BrIvr], [Ivr5].

However, we need to consider more general operator (4.34). Consider operator $Q = Q^w$ with symbol supported in $\mathcal{Z}_\rho$ with $\rho \leq \rho_1^*$.

Repeating arguments of the proof of proposition 4.1 we arrive to estimate (4.13) where $Q' = \mathcal{T}Q\psi'T^*$, ψ' is an element of γ -admissible partition in (x'', x''', ξ'') , $\gamma \geq \mu h$.

Restoring to Q we arrive to estimate

$$(4.38) \quad |F_{t \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau} \chi_T(t) \Gamma Q \psi u| \leq C h^{-d} T \rho^q \gamma \left(\left(\frac{h}{\rho^2 T} \right)^s + \left(\frac{h}{\rho \gamma} \right)^s + \left(\frac{\mu^{-1} h}{\gamma^2} \right)^s \right).$$

As $q \geq 2$ and $\mu \geq \mu_q^*$ we can take $\gamma = \mu h$ and $\rho \geq \bar{\rho}_0 \geq \mu^{-\frac{1}{q}}$; remaining *inner core* $\Omega_{00} = \{|\xi''| \leq \bar{\rho}_0\}$ will be considered separately. Then both $h/(\rho \gamma) = 1/(\mu \rho)$ and $\mu^{-1} h/\gamma = 1/(\mu^3 h)$ do not exceed h^δ and we arrive to estimate

$$(4.39) \quad |F_{t \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau} \chi_T(t) \Gamma Q \psi u| \leq C \mu h^{1-d} T \rho^q \left(\frac{h}{\rho^2 T} \right)^s$$

which in turn implies

$$(4.40) \quad |F_{t \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau} \bar{\chi}_T(t) \Gamma Q \psi u| \leq C \mu h^{1-d} \rho^q \times \frac{h}{\rho^2} = C \mu h^{2-d} \rho^{q-2},$$

as $T_0 = \epsilon \frac{h}{\rho^2} \leq T \leq T_1 = \epsilon \rho$.

Therefore, contribution of $\mathcal{Z}_\rho$ to the remainder estimate is $O(\mu h^{2-d} \rho^{q-3})$; integrated over $\frac{d\rho}{\rho}$ it gives $O(\mu h^{2-d}) = O(h^{1-d})$ as $q \geq 4$, $O(\mu h^{2-d} |\log h|) = O(h^{1-d})$ as $q = 3$, $O(\mu h^{2-d} \bar{\rho}_0^{-1})$ as $q = 2$.

On the other hand, contribution of the inner core $\Omega_{00} = \{|\xi''| \leq \rho_0\}$ to the remainder estimate is $O(\mu h^{1-d} \rho_0^q)$.

Therefore we will get remainder estimate $O(h^{1-d} + \mu h^{1-d} \rho_0^q)$ as $q \geq 3$ and $O(\mu h^{1-d}(\bar{\rho}_0^2 + h\bar{\rho}_0^{-1}))$ as $q = 2$ and we need to pick-up

$$(4.41) \quad \bar{\rho}_0 = \max(h^{\frac{1}{3}}, \mu^{-\frac{1}{2}})$$

finally arriving to the remainder estimate $O(h^{1-d})$ as $q \geq 3$ and $O(h^{1-d} + \mu h^{\frac{5}{3}-d})$ as $q = 2$ ¹¹.

Thus we proved

Proposition 4.6. *Let $q \geq 2$, (4.26) be fulfilled and $Q = Q(hD''')$, $Q = Q(\xi''')$ be operator with symbol supported in $\{|\xi'''| \leq C\bar{\rho}_1\}$, $\psi \in C_0^\infty(B(0, 1))$.*

Then

$$(4.42) \quad \mathcal{R}_2 Q \leq Ch^{1-d} + \begin{cases} 0 & q \geq 3, \\ Ch^{\frac{5}{3}-d}\mu & q = 2, \end{cases}$$

where $\bar{\chi} \in C_0^\infty([-1, 1])$, $\bar{\chi} = 1$ on $[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$, $Q = \sum_{0 \leq n \leq \bar{n}} Q_n$, Q_n are operators with symbols supported in $\{\frac{1}{2}\rho_n \leq |\xi'''| \leq 2\rho_n\}$ as $n = 1, \dots, N$, and in $\{|\xi'''| \leq 2\rho_0\}$ as $j = 0$, $\rho_n = 2^n \rho_0^*$, $\bar{n} = \lfloor \log \bar{\rho}_1 / \rho_0^* \rfloor + 1$, $T_n = \epsilon \rho_n$ ($n \geq 1$), $T_0 = \epsilon \mu^{-1}$.

This statement remains true with u replaced by u^0 which is the Schwartz kernel of $e^{ih^{-1}tA_0}$.

4.4 $q = 1$ in Generic settings. Intermediate zone

Let us repeat arguments of subsection 4.1 first as $q = 1$,

$$(4.43) \quad h^{-\frac{1}{3}} |\log h|^{-\frac{1}{3}} \leq \mu \leq \epsilon h^{-1} |\log h|^{-1},$$

$$(4.44) \quad |\xi_d| \asymp \rho \geq \rho_1^* = C(\mu h)^{\frac{1}{2}} + C\mu^{-1}.$$

The first problem is that the factor $(\rho^2 + \mu^{-1})$ in the right-hand expression of (4.14) is too large as $\mu \leq Ch^{-\frac{1}{2}}$; furthermore even if there are no unremovable cubic terms, one should take factor $(\rho^2 + \rho^{-1}h|\log h|)$ instead because we need to take $C\rho^{-1}h|\log h|$ scale with respect to x_d . I handled this problem in [Ivr6] as $d = 3$ and the idea from there (may be combined with the idea used in subsection 2.3) is applicable now.

The factor problem is rather simple.

Let us assume first that g^{jk} , F_{jk} are constant (and in particular there no unremovable cubic terms). Then this problem arises only as $\rho^3 \leq h|\log h|$ which implies $\mu \leq h^{-\frac{1}{3}} |\log h|^{\frac{2}{3}}$.

¹¹Similarly we would get $O(h^{1-d} + \mu h^{\frac{4}{3}-d})$ as $q = 1$ but there is a lot of other things to consider.

Let us consider a γ -covering with $\gamma = \rho^\delta$ and consider separately two types of elements:

(i) elements with $|\nabla V| \geq \zeta = |\log h|^{-2}$. If $|\partial_{x_d} V| \geq \zeta$ we have that ξ_d -shift for time $T \in [\bar{T}_0, \rho^{\delta_1}]$ is of magnitude no less than ζT and then since logarithmic uncertainty principle is fulfilled

$$\mu^{-1}\zeta \times \varepsilon \asymp \mu^{-2}\zeta \geq Ch|\log h|$$

we derive that $\chi_T \Gamma Q \psi u$ is negligible; otherwise $|\nabla_\perp V| \geq \zeta$ and similar arguments work for (x'', ξ'') -shifts.

(ii) elements with $|\nabla V| \leq \zeta$. We can take on them $\gamma = C(\mu^{-1}h)^{\frac{1}{2}}|\log h|$ which is larger than $C\rho^{-1}h|\log h|$ and replace the term γ by $C(\zeta\gamma + \gamma^l|\log h|^{-\sigma})$ which does not exceed $C\mu h$. In this case one can take $T_1 = \epsilon\rho\zeta^{-1}$.

Similar analysis combined with ideas of subsection 2.3 works in the general case as long as there are no unremovable cubic terms.

If there are unremovable terms of this type one can replace decomposition (4.7) by a similar decomposition with Υ_α orthonormal eigenfunctions of operator

$$(4.45) \quad \mathbf{a} = \mathcal{A}_0 + \mu^{-1} \sum_{j,k,m \leq 2r} \beta_{jkm} L_j L_k L_m + C_0 \mu^{-2} \mathcal{A}_0^2$$

with

$$(4.46) \quad \mathcal{A}_0 = \sum_{1 \leq j \leq r} \bar{f}_j (\mu^2 h^2 D_j^2 + x_j^2),$$

$L_{2j-1} = \mu h D_j$, $L_{2j} = x_j$ and Υ_β are replaced by their complex conjugates). We added the last term in (4.45) to make operator non-negative and self-adjoint; this term is $O(\mu^{-2})$ on u and thus it is included in the approximation error estimate $O(\mu^{-l}|\log \mu|^{-\sigma})$ anyway. We got operator (4.46) by rescaling $x' \mapsto \mu^{-1}x'$, $D_j \mapsto \mu D_j$.

For this operator $\mathbf{a}$ in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^r)$ the standard semiclassical eigenvalue asymptotics holds

$$(4.47) \quad \mathbf{n}(\tau, \hbar) = \text{Weyl} + O(\hbar^{1-r}), \quad \text{Weyl} \asymp \hbar^{-r} \quad \text{as } \hbar \rightarrow +0$$

and in particular

$$(4.48) \quad \mathbf{n}(\tau + \hbar, \hbar) - \mathbf{n}(\tau, \hbar) = O(\hbar^{1-r})$$

where “Weyl” means Weyl expression for $\mathbf{a}$ and we plug $\hbar = \mu h$.

Then the same modifications hold for estimates (4.14), (4.15) as well and then Tauberian arguments improve estimate (4.16) to

$$(4.49) \quad \mathcal{R}_{1Q} \leq C \left(h^{-d} \mu^{-1} \rho^2 \times \left(\frac{\mu h}{\rho^2} \right)^s + C h^{1-d} \right) |\log \rho|^{-2}$$

as $\mu \leq h^{\delta-1}$ because $T_1 \geq \epsilon_1 \rho |\log \rho|^2$ now.

Integrating the right-hand expression over $\frac{d\rho}{\rho}$ from ρ_1^* to $\bar{\rho}_1$ we get $O(h^{1-d})$ then. However for $h^{\delta-1} \leq \mu \leq h^{-1} |\log h|^{-1}$ we take only $T_1 = \epsilon_1 \rho$ and recover estimate $O(h^{1-d} |\log h|)$.

On the other hand, under microhyperbolicity condition for $\mu \leq \epsilon h^{-1} |\log h|^{-1}$ we can take $T_1 = \epsilon_1$ and recover estimate $O(h^{1-d})$ again.

Thus we have proven

Proposition 4.7. *Let $q = 1$, $(l, \sigma) = (1, 2)$. Then*

(i) *Estimate (4.24) holds. In particular for $\mu \leq Ch^{-\frac{1}{3}}$ sharp remainder estimate $\mathcal{R} \leq Ch^{1-d}$ holds.*

(ii) *in frames of proposition 4.2 $\mathcal{R}_{2Q}$ defined by (4.17) does not exceed $h^{1-d} |\log h|$ where again $T_n = \epsilon \rho_n$.*

(iii) *If either $\mu \leq h^{\delta-1}$ or f_j have constant multiplicities or microhyperbolicity condition is fulfilled at level 0, $\mathcal{R}_{2Q}$ defined by (4.17) does not exceed Ch^{1-d} where $T_n = \rho_n |\log \rho_n|^2$.*

(iv) *Furthermore, if Q is supported in $\{|\xi'''| \geq \rho\}$ and equal 1 in $\{|\xi'''| \geq \rho\}$ then $\mathcal{R}_{0Q}$ defined by (4.28) does not exceed $Ch^{1-d} + Ch^{-d} \rho (\mu h / \rho^2)^s$.*

4.5 $q = 1$ in Generic settings. Interior zone

In contrast to the case $q \geq 2$ skipping $O(\mu^{-1})$ terms is not now generally justified. Because of this we do not try now arguments of subsection 4.2 and we will use arguments of subsection 4.3 without skipping such terms first, assuming that

$$(4.50) \quad Ch^{-\frac{1}{3}} \leq \mu \leq \epsilon h^{-1} |\log h|^{-1},$$

$$(4.51) \quad C\mu^{-1} \leq |\xi_d| \asymp \rho \leq \rho_1^* = (\mu h)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Starting from (4.38) with $\gamma = \mu h$ due to the above arguments we arrive to

$$(4.52) \quad |F_{t \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau}(\bar{\chi}_T(t) - \bar{\chi}_{T_0}(t))\Gamma Q\psi u| \leq C\mu h^{1-d} \rho \left(T_0 \left(\frac{h}{\rho^2 T_0} \right)^s + T \left(\frac{h}{\rho \gamma} \right)^s + T \left(\frac{\mu^{-1} h}{\gamma^2} \right)^s \right)$$

as $T_0 = \frac{h}{\rho^2} \leq T \leq T_1 = \epsilon \rho$ and thus

$$(4.53) \quad |F_{t \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau} \bar{\chi}_T(t) \Gamma Q\psi u| \leq C\mu h^{1-d} \rho \left(\frac{h}{\rho^2} + T \left(\frac{h}{\rho \gamma} \right)^s + T \left(\frac{\mu^{-1} h}{\gamma^2} \right)^s \right).$$

Therefore due to Tauberian arguments

$$\begin{aligned}
 (4.54) \quad |\Gamma(Q\psi e) - h^{-1} \int_{-\infty}^0 \left(F_{t \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau} \bar{\chi}_T(t) \Gamma Q\psi u \right) d\tau| \leq \\
 C\mu T^{-1} h^{1-d} \rho \left(\frac{h}{\rho^2} + T \left(\frac{h}{\rho\gamma} \right)^s + T \left(\frac{\mu^{-1}h}{\gamma^2} \right)^s \right) = \\
 C\mu h^{1-d} \rho \left(h\rho^{-3} + \left(\frac{h}{\rho\gamma} \right)^s + \left(\frac{\mu^{-1}h}{\gamma^2} \right)^s \right).
 \end{aligned}$$

After integration the right-hand expression over $\frac{d\rho}{\rho}$ with ρ ranging from $\bar{\rho}_0$,

$$(4.55) \quad \bar{\rho}_0 = Ch^{\frac{1}{3}} \geq C\mu^{-1} \quad \text{as } \mu \geq \mu_1^*,$$

to ρ_1^* we get

$$(4.56) \quad C\mu h^{1-d} \rho \left(h\rho^{-3} + \left(\frac{h}{\rho\gamma} \right)^s \right) \Big|_{\rho=\bar{\rho}_0} + C\mu h^{1-d} \rho \left(\frac{\mu^{-1}h}{\gamma^2} \right)^s \Big|_{\rho=\rho_1^*}$$

where all terms excluding $C\mu h^{2-d} \bar{\rho}_0^{-2} = C\mu h^{\frac{4}{3}-d}$ do not exceed Ch^{1-d} .

Also, contribution of the inner core $\{|\xi_d| \leq \bar{\rho}_0\}$ does not exceed $C\mu h^{1-d} \bar{\rho}_0 = C\mu h^{\frac{4}{3}-d}$ as well.

So, the the final estimate is $Ch^{1-d} + C\mu h^{\frac{4}{3}-d}$. Thus we arrive to

Proposition 4.8. *Let $q = 1$, condition (4.50) be fulfilled and $Q = Q(hD''')$, $Q = Q(\xi''')$ be operator with symbol supported in $\{|\xi'''| \leq C\bar{\rho}_1\}$, $\psi \in C_0^\infty(B(0, 1))$.*

Then

$$(4.57) \quad \mathcal{R}_{2Q} \leq Ch^{1-d} + C\mu h^{\frac{4}{3}-d}$$

where $\mathcal{R}_{2Q}$ is defined by (4.17) with $Q = \sum_{0 \leq n \leq \bar{n}} Q_n(hD''')$, Q_n are operators with symbols supported in $\{\frac{1}{2}\rho_n \leq |\xi'''| \leq 2\rho_n\}$ as $n = 1, \dots, \bar{n}$, and in $\{|\xi'''| \leq 2\rho_0\}$ as $n = 0$, $\rho_n = 2^n \rho_0^*$, $\bar{n} = \lfloor \log \bar{\rho}_1 / \rho_0^* \rfloor + 1$, $T_n = \epsilon \rho_n$ ($n \geq 1$), $T_0 = \epsilon \mu^{-1}$.

4.6 $q = 1, 2$ under microhyperbolicity condition

We repeat arguments of subsection 4.3, but we will use microhyperbolicity at some moment. Namely, (4.10) implies that

$$(4.58) \quad |F_{t \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau} \chi_T(t) \Gamma Q' \psi u| \leq C \mu^r h^{r-d} T \rho^q \times \\ \left(\left(\frac{h}{\rho^2 T} \right)^s + \left(\frac{h}{\rho \gamma} \right)^s + \left(\frac{\mu^{-1} h}{\gamma^2} \right)^s \right) \times \\ \gamma^s \int_{B(z, 2\gamma)} \|\operatorname{tr}(\mathcal{A}(x', x''', \xi'') + i\gamma)^{-s}\| dx'' dx''' d\xi''$$

where $B(z, \gamma) \supset \operatorname{supp} Q'$, $\mathcal{A}$ is an operator reduced and considered as an operator in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^r, \mathbb{C})$ and $\|\cdot\|$ is an operator norm there. Then the same estimate (with an integral over $B(0, 1)$) holds as Q' is replaced by Q and due to microhyperbolicity the last integral is of magnitude $\gamma(\mu h)^{-r}$ as $\gamma \geq \rho^2$; even condition $\gamma \geq \mu^{-1}$ is not needed anymore if we consider operator (4.44) from the beginning¹².

So,

$$(4.59) \quad |F_{t \rightarrow h^{-d}\tau} \chi_T(t) \Gamma Q \psi u| \leq C h^{-d} \gamma T \rho^q \times \left(\left(\frac{h}{\rho^2 T} \right)^s + \left(\frac{h}{\rho \gamma} \right)^s + \left(\frac{\mu^{-1} h}{\gamma^2} \right)^s \right)$$

as $h/\rho^2 \leq T \leq \epsilon \rho$ and picking up $\gamma = \rho^2$, $\rho \geq \bar{\rho}_0 = h^{\frac{1}{3}-\delta} \geq \mu^{-1}$ we rewrite the right-hand expression as $C h^{-d} T \rho^{q+2} \left(\frac{h}{\rho^2 T} \right)^s$. Note that we changed here definition of $\bar{\rho}_0$ and the corresponding notion of the inner core.

Then (4.59) implies that

$$(4.60) \quad |F_{t \rightarrow h^{-d}\tau} \bar{\chi}_T(t) \Gamma Q \psi u| \leq C h^{1-d} \rho^q$$

as long as $T \leq \epsilon \rho$, $\rho \geq \bar{\rho}_0$.

However, due to the microhyperbolicity condition $F_{t \rightarrow h^{-d}\tau} \chi_T(t) \Gamma Q \psi u$ is negligible as long $C h |\log h| \varepsilon^{-1} \leq T \leq \epsilon$ and $T = \epsilon \rho$ satisfies this inequality as long as

$$(4.61) \quad \rho \geq C \bar{\rho}_0, \quad \varepsilon \geq C h \rho^{-1} |\log h|.$$

So, (4.61) yields that (4.60) holds for $T \leq \epsilon$.

¹²As $q \geq 2$ we can skip all the $O(\mu^{-1})$ terms. As $q = 1$ we preserve all the terms which do not contain factor $h D_d$, we skip all such terms containing $(h D_d)^2$ because this leads to the approximation error $\rho^2 \mu^{-1}$ and then we remove as in [Ivr6] all such terms containing $h D_d$ exactly in power 1.

Then we can apply Tauberian arguments giving estimate with right-hand expression $Ch^{1-d}\rho^q$. This last estimate hold for $\rho \leq \bar{\rho}_1$ as well. Integration of this expression over $\frac{d\rho}{\rho}$ gives remainder estimate $O(h^{1-d})$.

Consider now contribution of the inner core $\{|\xi'''\| \leq \bar{\rho}_0\}$. In this zone we get estimate

$$(4.62) \quad |F_{t \rightarrow h^{-d}\tau} \bar{\chi}_T(t) \Gamma Q \psi u| \leq Ch^{-d} \rho_0^{q+3},$$

as $T = \rho$ and $\rho \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bar{\rho}_0$ there; then microhyperbolicity arguments push it to $T = \epsilon$ under condition (4.61) and then Tauberian arguments lead us to contribution to the remainder not exceeding $Ch^{-d} \bar{\rho}_0^{q+3}$ which is $O(h^{1-d})$ as $q \geq 1$, δ small enough.

Thus under microhyperbolicity condition remainder estimate is $O(h^{1-d})$ even as $q = 1, 2$ but we need to look at an approximation error; one can prove easily that for smallest $\varepsilon \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} C\rho^{-1}h|\log h|$ satisfying (4.61) it is also $O(h^{1-d})$. Thus we have

Proposition 4.9. *Under microhyperbolicity condition $\mathcal{R}_{1Q}$ does not exceed Ch^{1-d} where $\mathcal{R}_{1Q}$ is given by (4.16) with $T = \epsilon$.*

4.7 $q = 1, 2$ and constant multiplicities of f_j

Assume that f_j have constant multiplicities. Then in both interior and intermediate zones after reduction and skipping $O(\mu^{-1})$ terms which are due to the third resonances and all smaller terms¹³ instead of “matrix” operator we get a family of “scalar” operators

$$(4.63) \quad A_\alpha(x'', x''', \mu^{-1}hD'', hD''') = \sum_{j,k \leq r} (hD_j) g^{jk}(x'', x''', \mu^{-1}hD''') (hD_k) + V_\alpha(x'', x''', \mu^{-1}hD''')$$

and we can study them separately. Let us apply standard rescaling procedure: for each index α we introduce functions $\gamma = \gamma_\alpha$ and $\varrho = \varrho_\alpha$ by

$$(4.64) \quad \gamma = \inf \left\{ r : \vartheta(r) \geq \rho^2 + |V_\alpha(x'', x''', \xi'')|, \vartheta(r)r^{-1} \geq |\nabla V_\alpha(x'', x''', \xi'')| \right\} + \bar{\gamma},$$

$$(4.65) \quad \varrho = \vartheta(\gamma)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

$$(4.66) \quad \bar{\varrho} = \vartheta(\bar{\gamma})^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \bar{\varrho}\bar{\gamma} = Ch \implies \bar{\varrho} = h^{\frac{l}{l+2}} |\log \mu|^{-\frac{l\sigma}{2(l+2)}}, \quad \bar{\gamma} = h^{\frac{2}{l+2}} |\log h|^{\frac{\sigma}{l+2}}$$

where we assume that $(1, 1) \preceq (l, \sigma) \preceq (2, 0)$. Note that $\gamma^2 \geq C\mu^{-1}h|\log h|$.

¹³The case of $q = 1$ where there are such terms will be considered in details in the next subsection

(i) Consider first elements with $\gamma \geq C\bar{\gamma}$. Calculating contribution of each element of $(\gamma; \rho)$ -partition with respect to $(x'', x''', \xi''; \xi''')$ we can apply elliptic arguments unless $\epsilon \varrho \leq \rho \leq C\varrho$; in the latter case we can apply microhyperbolic arguments; then contribution of each element to the remainder estimate does not exceed $C\mu^r h^{r-d+1} \varrho^{q-1} \gamma^{d-1}$ in the latter case and

$$C\mu^r h^{r-d+1} \varrho^{q-1} \gamma^{d-1} \times \left(\frac{h}{(\rho + \varrho)\gamma} \right)^s$$

in the former one.

Then the contribution of each such element $\mathcal{W}$ of γ -partition with respect to (x'', x''', ξ') ¹⁴ to the remainder also does not exceed $C\mu^r h^{r-d+1} \varrho^{q-1} \gamma^{d-1}$.

Then the total contribution of such elements to the remainder estimate for given α does not exceed

$$C \int \mu^r h^{r-d+1} \varrho_\alpha^{q-1} \gamma_\alpha^{-1} dz$$

with $z = (x'', x''', \xi'')$ and after summation over all indices we get

$$(4.67) \quad C \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}^{+r}} \mu^r h^{r-d+1} \int \varrho_\alpha^{q-1} \gamma_\alpha^{-1} dz.$$

(ii) On the other hand, contribution of each element of γ -partition with $\gamma \leq C\bar{\gamma}$ does not exceed $C\mu^r h^{r-d} \gamma^d \bar{\varrho}^q$ and their total contribution does not exceed (4.67) as well.

Since for given (z, ρ)

$$(4.68) \quad \#\{\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}^{+r} : \epsilon \rho^2 \leq \varrho_\alpha^2 \leq c \rho^2\} \leq C(\mu h)^{-r} (\rho^2 + \mu h)$$

expression (4.67) does not exceed

$$(4.69) \quad C\mu h^{2-d} \int \varrho_1^{q-1} \gamma_1^{-1} dz + Ch^{1-d} \int \rho^q \gamma(\rho)^{-1} d\rho$$

where $\gamma_1 = \min_\alpha \gamma_\alpha$ and ϱ_1 corresponds to it, $\gamma(\rho)$ is defined from equation $\vartheta(\gamma) = \rho$.

One can see easily that the second term does not exceed Ch^{1-d} , while the first term does not exceed

$$C\mu h^{2-d} \int \gamma^{\frac{(q-1)l}{2}-2} |\log \gamma|^{-\frac{(q-1)\sigma}{2}} d\gamma$$

which in turn does not exceed $C\mu h^{1-d} \bar{\varrho}^q$ unless $q = 2, l = 2$. In the latter case $\sigma \leq 0$ and the first term does not exceed $C\mu h^{2-d} |\log h|^{-\sigma}$. In both cases we arrive to the remainder estimate

$$(4.70) \quad \mathcal{R}_{2Q} \leq Ch^{1-d} + C\mu h^{1-d+\frac{ql}{l+2}} |\log \mu|^{-\frac{q\sigma}{(l+2)}}$$

¹⁴More precisely, of $\mathcal{W} \times \{|\xi''| \leq C\rho_1^*\}$.

which is exactly remainder estimate (0.40). I remind that it is $C\mu h^{2-d}$ as $(l, \sigma) = (2, 0)$. Here $T = \gamma/\varrho$.

Thus we have proven

Proposition 4.10. *Let $q = 1, 2$, $\mu \geq \mu_q^*$, f_j have constant multiplicities and $\mathcal{A}$ contain no unremovable cubic terms¹⁵. Let $Q = Q(hD''')$, $Q = Q(\xi''')$ be operator with symbol supported in $\{|\xi'''| \leq C\bar{\rho}_1\}$, $\psi \in C_0^\infty(B(0, 1))$.*

Then estimate (4.70) holds with $\mathcal{R}_{2Q}$ given by (4.17) with $Q = \sum_{0 \leq n \leq \bar{n}} Q_n(hD''')$, Q_n are operators with symbols supported in $\{\frac{1}{2}\gamma_n \leq \gamma \leq 2\gamma_n\}$ as $n = 1, \dots, \bar{n}$, and in $\{\gamma \leq 2\bar{\gamma}\}$ as $n = 0$, $N = \lfloor \log \bar{\gamma} \rfloor + 1$, $\gamma_n = 2^{-n}$, $T_n = C\gamma_n^{1-\frac{l}{2}} |\log \gamma_n|^{-\frac{\sigma}{2}}$ ($n \geq 1$), $T_0 = \epsilon\mu^{-1}$.

On the other hand, if $q = 1$ skipping unremovable terms in $\mathcal{A}$ comes with a price of $O(\mu^{\frac{1}{2}}h^{1-d} + \mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}h^{\frac{1}{2}-d})$ error. If we would prefer not to remove them, we cannot treat separate equations. However we can do as well as before assuming that

$$(4.71) \quad f_j = \text{const}, \quad j = 1, \dots, r$$

which by no means excludes variable g^{jk} , F_{jk} or unremovable cubic terms.

We can introduce then

$$(4.72) \quad \gamma = \inf \left\{ r : \vartheta(r) \geq \rho^2, \vartheta(r)r^{-1} \geq |\nabla V(x'', x''', \xi'')| \right\} + \bar{\gamma},$$

and ϱ by (4.65) and $\bar{\varrho}$, $\bar{\gamma}$ by (4.66). Then we can apply our standard arguments as long as

$$(4.73) \quad \rho^2 + |\nabla V| \geq C\mu^{-1}$$

which will be fulfilled automatically for $\gamma \geq C\bar{\gamma}$ as long as

$$(4.74) \quad \bar{\rho} \geq C\mu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \iff \mu \geq Ch^{-\frac{2l}{l+2}} |\log h|^{\frac{2\sigma}{l+2}}$$

with the right-hand expression exceeding $h^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ for sure. So, under condition (4.74) estimate (4.70) holds. On the other hand, if condition (4.74) is violated, we need also consider elements with violated (4.73), in particular, $|\nabla V| \leq C\mu^{-1}$ and

$$(4.75) \quad \gamma \leq \hat{\gamma} = C\mu^{-\frac{1}{l}} |\log h|^{\frac{\sigma}{l}},$$

¹⁵May be we just dropped them in the interior zone causing an error $O(h^{1-d})$ if either $q = 2$ or $q = 1$ and each of these terms contained factor $\mu^{-1}hD_d$ and an error $O(\mu^{\frac{1}{2}}h^{1-d})$ in the generic case as $q = 1$.

Instead of γ partition we consider $\max(\gamma, \hat{\gamma})$ -partition and on elements with $\gamma = \hat{\gamma}$ let us introduce

$$(4.76) \quad \gamma' = \hat{\gamma}\mu\rho^2 + \bar{\gamma}', \quad \varrho' = \rho + \bar{\rho}',$$

$$(4.77) \quad \bar{\gamma}' = \mu^{\frac{1}{3}}\hat{\gamma}^{\frac{1}{3}}h^{\frac{2}{3}} = h^{\frac{2}{3}}\mu^{\frac{l-1}{3l}}|\log h|^{\frac{\sigma}{3l}}, \quad \bar{\rho}' = \mu^{-\frac{1}{3}}\hat{\gamma}^{-\frac{1}{3}}h^{\frac{1}{3}}$$

Then we arrive to the remainder estimate $Ch^{1-d} + C\mu h^{2-d}\bar{\gamma}'^{-1}$.

Proposition 4.11. *Let $q = 1$, $\mu \geq \mu_1^*$ and condition (4.71) be fulfilled. Then*

(i) *Under condition (4.74) estimate (4.70) holds.*

(ii) *If condition (4.74) is violated then estimate*

$$(4.78) \quad \mathcal{R}_{2Q} \leq Ch^{1-d} + C\mu h^{1-d+\frac{l}{l+2}}|\log \mu|^{-\frac{\sigma}{(l+2)}} + C\mu^{\frac{2l+1}{3l}}h^{\frac{4}{3}-d}|\log \mu|^{-\frac{\sigma}{3l}}$$

holds.

Remark 4.12. (i) Condition (4.74) means exactly that the third term in the right-hand expression of (4.78) does not exceed the second one.

(ii) If condition (4.71) is violated one needs to take in account that as the main part is of the form $\xi_d^2 + \sum_{1 \leq j \leq r} f_j^w(\mu^2 x_j^2 + h^2 D_j^2) + V^w$ with $f_j = f_j(x'', x_d, \xi'')$, $V = V(x'', x_d, \xi'')$, its gradient with respect to x'', x_d, ξ'' depends on the localization with respect to $\{(\mu^2 x_j^2 + h^2 \xi_j^2), j = 1, \dots, r\}$ and there is at least one obstacle to it: due to logarithmic uncertainty principle these quantities are defined with $C\mu h|\log h|$ precision. Therefore one must take $\hat{\gamma}^{l-1}|\log \hat{\gamma}|^{-\sigma} \geq C\mu h|\log h|$ in the arguments leading to proposition 4.11 which deteriorates estimate (4.70). It does not look worth needed efforts.

(iii) Another approach would be to drop unremovable cubic terms as $\rho \geq \hat{\rho}$ paying the price of $O(h^{2-d}\hat{\rho}^{-1})$ for this and apply the same arguments as above. Then remainder estimate is $C\mu h^{\frac{4}{3}-d}\hat{\rho}^{\frac{2}{3}}\hat{\gamma}^{\frac{1}{3}}$ where $\hat{\gamma} = \hat{\rho}^{\frac{2}{l}}|\log h|^{\frac{\sigma}{l}}$ and one should optimize the answer with respect to $\hat{\rho}$ which is not $\mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ anymore.

4.8 Improved remainder estimates

There are peculiar cases when without microhyperbolicity one can improve generic remainder estimate $\mathcal{R}_I \leq Ch^{1-d} + C\mu h^{1+\frac{q}{3}-d}$ or estimates (4.70), (4.78). It happens only for $r \geq 2$.

Note that the factor estimating the number of indices one needs to take in account is actually $(\mathbf{n}(\tau, \mu h) - \mathbf{n}(\tau - C\rho^2, \mu h))$ where $\mathbf{n}(\tau, \mu h)$ is an eigenvalue counting function for operator $\mathbf{a}$ in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^r, \mathbb{C})$ calculated at any point (x'', x''', ξ'') at $\text{supp } Q$ while so far we used estimate $C(\rho^2 + \mu h)(\mu h)^{-r}$ for this difference.

Therefore one can replace term $C\mu h^{1-d}\bar{\varrho}^q$ we have in frames of proposition 4.10 by

$$(4.79) \quad C\mu^r h^{r-d+1} \int \int_{\bar{\varrho}}^{\rho_1^*} (\mathbf{n}(x, \tau, \mu h) - \mathbf{n}(x, \tau - C\rho^2, \mu h)) \rho^{q-1} \gamma^{-1} d\rho dx + \\ C\mu^r h^{r-d} \int (\mathbf{n}(x, \tau, \mu h) - \mathbf{n}(x, \tau - C\bar{\varrho}^2, \mu h)) \bar{\varrho}^q dx$$

with $\gamma = \varrho^{\frac{2}{l}} |\log \rho|^{\frac{\sigma}{l}}$, $\bar{\varrho} = h^{\frac{l}{l+2}} |\log h|^{-\frac{\sigma}{l+2}}$ where we already returned to coordinates x .

Also, in the generic settings one can replace term $C\mu h^{1+\frac{q}{3}-d}$ by expression (4.79) with $\gamma = \rho^2$ and $\bar{\varrho} = h^{\frac{1}{3}}$.

Consider two examples

Example 4.13. Consider eigenvalue counting function $\mathbf{n}_0 = \mathbf{n}_0(\tau, \hbar)$ of operator $\mathbf{a}_0 = \mathcal{A}_0$ in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^r, \mathbb{C})$; since $\mathcal{A}_0$ depends on (x'', x'', ξ'') , so does $\mathbf{n}_0$ and we can always return to variable x by map Ψ_0 . Since $\mathcal{A}_0$ contains only quadratic terms one can calculate $\mathbf{n}_0$ explicitly

$$(4.80) \quad \mathbf{n}_0(\tau, \hbar) = \#\{\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}^{+r} : \sum_j (2\alpha_j + 1) f_j \hbar + V < \tau\}.$$

If all $f_1, \dots, f_r$ are comeasurable then

$$\mathbf{n}_0(\tau, \hbar) - \mathbf{n}_0(\tau - \lambda, \hbar) \leq C\hbar^{1-r}(\lambda + \hbar)$$

is the best possible estimate ($\lambda \geq 0$); otherwise from

$$(4.81) \quad \mathbf{n}_0(\tau, \hbar) - \mathbf{n}_0(\tau - \lambda, \hbar) = \sum_{n \geq 0} \#\{\alpha' \in \mathbb{Z}^{+r-1} : \sum_{j \geq 2} \frac{f_j}{f_1} (2\alpha_j + 1) \hbar \in \\ [f_1^{-1}(\tau - V) - 2(n+1) - f_1^{-1}\lambda, f_1^{-1}(\tau - V) - 2(n+1))\}$$

one can derive a better estimate $C\hbar^{-r}(\lambda + \nu(\hbar))$ with $\nu(\hbar) = C\hbar^\kappa$, $\kappa > 1$ depending on Diophantine properties of $\{f_2/f_1, \dots, f_r/f_1\}$ (see [Har]).

Example 4.14. Let us assume that¹⁶

$$(4.82) \quad \text{rank}\{\nabla \frac{f_2}{f_1}, \dots, \nabla \frac{f_r}{f_1}\} \geq \kappa - 1 \quad \forall x.$$

¹⁶Actually we need a quantitative version of this condition and only at points where ∇V is a linear combination of $\nabla f_1, \dots, \nabla f_r$.

It is easy to recover an integrated version of (4.81), namely (0.33) with $\nu(\hbar) = C\hbar^\kappa$. Really, one needs just to consider ζ -admissible partition in $(\alpha\hbar, x)$ -space with scaling function $\zeta = \epsilon|\nabla(\tau - V - \sum_j(2\alpha_j + 1)f_j\hbar)|$.

Furthermore, these arguments show that for $\mathbf{n}$ the left-hand expression of (0.33) does not exceed $C\hbar^{1-r}(\lambda + \hbar^\kappa + \mu^{-\kappa})$.

Then we arrive to

Proposition 4.15. *Let condition (0.33) hold for $\mathbf{n}_0$ which is an eigenvalue counting function for $\mathcal{A}_0$. Let $\mu_q^* \leq \mu \leq \epsilon h^{-1}|\log h|^{-1}$.*

(i) *Let either $q = 2$ or $q = 1$ and $\mathcal{A}$ contain no unremovable cubic terms¹⁷. Then*

$$(4.83) \quad \mathcal{R}_{2,Q} \leq Ch^{1-d} + C\nu(\mu h)h^{\frac{q}{3}-d};$$

(ii) *Assuming instead that $\mathbf{n}$ which is an eigenvalue counting function for $\mathbf{a}$, satisfies (0.33), we need neither assumption “ $\mathcal{A}$ contains no unremovable cubic terms” in (i) nor (0.33) for $\mathbf{n}_0$;*

(iii) *Let $q = 1$ and $\mathcal{A}$ contain unremovable cubic terms and $\mu \geq h^{-\frac{1}{2}}|\log h|^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. Then*

$$(4.84) \quad \mathcal{R}_{2,Q} \leq Ch^{1-d} + C\nu(\mu h)h^{\frac{1}{3}-d} + C\mu^{-1}h^{\frac{1}{3}-d}.$$

Proof. Statements (i) and (ii) follow directly from above arguments. In (iii) one needs to notice that (0.33) for $\mathbf{n}_0$ implies

$$(4.85) \quad \int (\mathbf{n}(x, \tau, \hbar) - \mathbf{n}(x, \tau - \lambda, \hbar)) dx \leq C(\lambda + \mu^{-1} + \nu(\hbar))\hbar^{-r}.$$

□

Remark 4.16. (i) If $q = 1$ and (0.33) holds then dropping unremovable cubic terms leads to an error not exceeding

$$(4.86) \quad C\nu(\mu h)\mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}h^{-d} + C\mu^{-\frac{3}{2}}h^{-d}.$$

(ii) As $\mu \geq h^{-\frac{2}{3}}$ last terms in the right-hand expression of (4.84) and in (4.86) do not exceed Ch^{1-d} .

Similarly one can prove

¹⁷ Unremovable cubic terms containing hD_d are allowed.

Proposition 4.17. *Let $q = 1, 2$ and f_j have constant multiplicities. Let condition (0.33) hold for $\mathbf{n}_0$. Let $\mu_q^* \leq \mu \leq \epsilon h^{-1} |\log h|^{-1}$.*

(i) *Let either $q = 2$ or $q = 1$ and $\mathcal{A}$ contain no unremovable cubic terms. Then*

$$(4.87) \quad \mathcal{R}_{2Q} \leq Ch^{1-d} + C\nu(\mu h) \cdot h^{-d+\frac{lq}{l+2}} |\log \mu|^{-\frac{lq\sigma}{2(l+2)}};$$

(ii) *Let $q = 1$, condition (4.71) be fulfilled, $\mathcal{A}$ contain unremovable cubic terms, estimate (0.33) hold for $\mathbf{n}$ as well and $\mu \geq h^{-\frac{1}{2}} |\log h|^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. Then estimate (4.84) holds as (4.74) is fulfilled and estimate*

$$(4.88) \quad \mathcal{R}_{2Q} \leq Ch^{1-d} + C\nu(\mu h) \left(h^{-d+\frac{l}{l+2}} |\log \mu|^{-\frac{l\sigma}{2(l+2)}} + C\mu^{-\frac{l-1}{3l}} h^{-\frac{2}{3}-d} |\log h|^{-\frac{\sigma}{3l}} \right)$$

holds as (4.74) fails;

(iii) *Let $q = 1$, condition (4.71) be fulfilled, $\mathcal{A}$ contain unremovable cubic terms and $\mu \geq h^{-\frac{1}{2}} |\log h|^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. Then estimate*

$$(4.89) \quad \mathcal{R}_{2Q} \leq Ch^{1-d} + C(\nu(\mu h) + \mu^{-1}) \cdot h^{-d+\frac{lq}{l+2}} |\log \mu|^{-\frac{lq\sigma}{2(l+2)}};$$

holds as (4.74) is fulfilled and estimate

$$(4.90) \quad \mathcal{R}_{2Q} \leq Ch^{1-d} + C(\nu(\mu h) + \mu^{-1}) \cdot \left(h^{-d+\frac{l}{l+2}} |\log \mu|^{-\frac{l\sigma}{2(l+2)}} + C\mu^{-\frac{l-1}{3l}} h^{-\frac{2}{3}-d} |\log h|^{-\frac{\sigma}{3l}} \right)$$

holds as (4.74) fails.

4.9 Strong Magnetic Field

4.9.1 Generic settings

Consider now strong magnetic field case $\epsilon h^{-1} |\log h|^{-1} \leq \mu \leq \epsilon h^{-1}$. I remind that reduction to the canonical form was done with $\varepsilon = C(\mu^{-1} h |\log h|)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ rather than $C\mu^{-1}$; furthermore, exterior zone is empty now and $\bar{\rho}_1 = C$ rather than $\bar{\rho}_1 = C(\mu h |\log h|)^{\frac{1}{2}}$.

As $q \geq 2$ throwing away $O(\mu^{-1})$ terms brings an $O(h^{1-d})$ error of $\mathcal{E}^{\text{MW}}$. Then all the arguments of subsections 4.1–4.3 remain true and remainder estimate will be $O(h^{1-d})$ as $q \geq 3$, $O(\mu h^{\frac{5}{3}-d})$ as $q = 2$ and $O(\mu h^{\frac{4}{3}-d})$ as $q = 1$; in the latter case contribution of the intermediate zone is estimated by $Ch^{1-d} |\log h|$. So, *in the generic settings previous results hold without modifications:*

Proposition 4.18. *Propositions 4.1, 4.2, 4.4–4.8 and theorem 4.3 remain valid for strong magnetic field as well.*

Thus in what follows we need to consider cases $q = 1, 2$ only.

4.9.2 Microhyperbolic case

We must distinguish two cases:

(i) Microhyperbolicity direction ℓ does not depend on τ . In this case all the arguments of subsections 4.1–4.4 remain true and the remainder estimate is $O(h^{1-d})$.

In particular, the case of f_j having constant multiplicities is covered. Really, in this case microhyperbolicity condition means exactly that at each point x

$$(4.91) \quad \sum_{1 \leq j \leq r_1} \tau_j \nabla \left(\frac{f_j}{V} \right) = 0, \quad \forall_j \tau_j \geq 0 \implies \forall_j \tau_j = 0;$$

then there exists vector $\ell = \ell(x)$ such that

$$(4.92) \quad \langle \ell, \nabla \left(\frac{f_j}{V} \right) \rangle > 0 \quad \forall j$$

which exactly means microhyperbolicity in direction ℓ .

(ii) Microhyperbolicity condition is fulfilled with ℓ depending on τ . Then as in [Ivr7] one should take

$$(4.93) \quad \varepsilon = Ch |\log h| e^{C\mu h |\log h|}$$

and while remainder estimate will be still $O(h^{1-d})$, approximation error does not exceed

$$Ch^{-d} (\mu^{-1} h |\log h|)^{\frac{l}{2}} e^{C\mu h |\log h|} |\log h|^{-\sigma}$$

which is $O(h^{1-d})$ as $l > 1$ and $\mu h < \epsilon'$ with small enough ϵ' ; as $l = 1$ we arrive to

$$(4.94) \quad \mathcal{R}_1 \leq Ch^{1-d} e^{C\mu h |\log h|} |\log h|^{1-\sigma}.$$

So, we have proven

Proposition 4.19. *In the strong magnetic field case under microhyperbolicity condition $\mathcal{R}_1$ does not exceed Ch^{1-d} where $\mathcal{R}_1$ is given by (4.16) with $T = \epsilon$, $Q = I$ provided either microhyperbolicity direction does not depend on τ or $l > 1$. Otherwise estimate (4.94) holds.*

4.9.3 $q = 1, 2$ and f_j have constant multiplicities

Assuming that there are no cubic terms we get a family of separate operators $\mathcal{A}_\alpha$ and all the previous arguments hold bringing us remainder estimate (4.70). On the other hand, as $q = 1$ dropping unremovable cubic terms produces an error $C\mu^{\frac{1}{2}} h^{1-d}$ which is less than the right-hand expression of (4.70) unless $l = 2$, $\sigma \in (-4, 0]$. In this case assuming (4.71) one can prove easily (4.70) as well. So we have

Proposition 4.20. (i) *In the strong magnetic field as f_j have constant multiplicities estimate (4.70) holds unless $q = 1$, $l = 2$, $\sigma \in (-4, 0]$ and there are unremovable cubic terms.*

(ii) *In this exceptional case should include extra term $C\mu^{\frac{1}{2}}h^{1-d}$ in the right-hand expression.*

4.9.4 Improvement without microhyperbolicity

Furthermore, under condition (0.33) for $\mathbf{n}_0$ we get remainder estimate (4.83) in frames of proposition 4.15(i) which is a very subtle improvement now.

Moreover, if f_j have constant multiplicities we can recover (4.87) in frames of proposition 4.17 (i).

Proposition 4.21. *In the strong magnetic field propositions 4.15, 4.17 remain valid.*

4.10 Superstrong Magnetic Field

Consider now the superstrong magnetic field case $\epsilon h^{-1} \leq \mu \leq Ch^{-1}$. Then the same arguments as before but in simplified form hold and one can prove easily

Proposition 4.22. *For superstrong magnetic field for*

(i) *In the generic settings remainder estimate $\mathcal{R}_2 \leq Ch^{1-d}$ holds as $q \geq 3$, remainder estimate $\mathcal{R}_2 \leq C\mu h^{\frac{5}{3}-d} = O(h^{\frac{2}{3}-d})$ holds as $q = 2$ and remainder estimate $\mathcal{R}_2 \leq C\mu h^{\frac{4}{3}-d} = O(h^{\frac{1}{3}-d})$ holds as $q = 1$.*

(ii) *If $q = 1, 2$ and microhyperbolicity condition 0.2 with ℓ independent on τ is fulfilled then remainder estimate $\mathcal{R}_1 \leq Ch^{1-d}$ holds.*

(iii) *If $q = 1, 2$ and f_j have constant multiplicities then remainder estimate $\mathcal{R}_2 \leq Ch^{-d+\frac{lq}{l+2}} |\log h|^{-\frac{lq\sigma}{2(l+2)}}$ holds.*

Note that we can ignore cubic terms (which are $O(h)$ now).

4.11 Ultrastrong Magnetic Field

The last and the easiest case to consider is $\mu \geq Ch^{-1}$. Then we arrive to a single operator

$$(4.95) \quad \mathcal{A}_0 = h^2 \sum_{2r+1 \leq j, k \leq d} D_j g^{jk}(x'', x''', \mu^{-1}hD'') D_k + a_0(x'', x''', \mu^{-1}hD'')$$

where I remind that

$$a_0 = W \circ \Psi_0, \quad W = V - \sum_j f_j \mu h$$

belongs to $C^{l,\sigma}$ uniformly.

Surely we get a system, but all other components $u_{\alpha,\beta}$ (with $(\alpha,\beta) \neq 0$) could be expressed via $u_{0,0}$.

Then the principal part of asymptotics (as $|W| \leq c$) is of magnitude $\mu^r h^{r-d}$. For the remainder estimate we have

Proposition 4.23. *For ultrastrong magnetic field*

- (i) *As $q \geq 3$ remainder estimate $\mathcal{R}_2 \leq C\mu^r h^{r+1-d}$ holds.*
- (ii) *As $q = 1, 2$ and microhyperbolicity condition*

$$(4.96) \quad |W| + |\nabla W| \geq \epsilon$$

is fulfilled then remainder estimate $\mathcal{R}_1 \leq C\mu^r h^{r+1-d}$ holds.

- (iii) *As $q = 1, 2$ remainder estimate*

$$(4.97) \quad \mathcal{R}_2 \leq \begin{cases} C\mu^r h^{r+\frac{2l}{l+2}-d} |\log h|^{-\frac{2\sigma}{l+2}} & q = 2, \\ C\mu^r h^{r+\frac{l}{l+2}-d} |\log h|^{-\frac{\sigma}{l+2}} & q = 1 \end{cases}$$

holds.

On the other hand, mollification and approximation error in operator is $O(h)$ and if either $q \geq 2$ or microhyperbolicity condition holds mollification and approximation error in Weyl expression is $O(h)$ multiplied by $\mu^r h^{r-d}$ i.e. $\mu^r h^{r+1-d}$.

On the other hand if $q = 1$ and there is no microhyperbolicity condition mollification and approximation error is $O(h^{\frac{1}{2}})$ multiplied by $\mu^r h^{r-d}$ i.e. $\mu^r h^{r+\frac{1}{2}-d}$.

In both cases mollification and approximation error does not exceed the remainder estimate.

5 Asymptotics

Now we need to derive more explicit asymptotics rather than formula (2.27) or its clones:

$$(5.1) \quad \begin{aligned} & h^{-1} \int_{-\infty}^0 F_{t \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau} \bar{\chi}_T(t) \Gamma(Q_x \psi_x u) d\tau, \\ & h^{-1} \int_{-\infty}^0 F_{t \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau} \bar{\chi}_T(t) \Gamma(u \psi_y Q_y^t) d\tau \end{aligned}$$

with different T where $\psi_y = \psi(y)$, $Q_y = Q(y, hD_y)$ and Q^t means the dual operator; we write operators acting with respect to y on the right from a function. Both expressions coincide due to the trace property.

5.1 Weak magnetic field redone

Weak magnetic field case is when $\mu \leq h^{\delta-1}$ and we derived asymptotics with the principal part given (5.1) with $Q = I$, $T = \epsilon\mu^{-1}$ and with some remainder estimate derived without canonical form reduction.

Note that the mollified operator $\tilde{A}$ is microhyperbolic in direction $\langle \xi, \partial_\xi \rangle$ due to condition (0.7). Further, in zone $\{|\xi''| \geq \epsilon'\}$ this operator is a differential operator since we take there $\varepsilon = Ch|\log h|$ which does not depend on $|\xi''|$.

On the other hand, in zone $\{|\xi''| \leq \frac{1}{2}\epsilon'\}$ operator $\tilde{A}$ is microhyperbolic in direction $\langle \xi', \partial_{\xi'} \rangle + \langle \xi'', \partial_{\xi''} \rangle$ and it is a differential operator with respect to x', x'' since mollification parameter $\varepsilon = C\rho^{-1}h|\log h|$ does not depend on ξ', ξ'' .

Due to the standard results rescaled then $F_{t \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau} \chi_T(t) \Gamma(u\psi_y)$ is negligible as $|\tau| \leq \epsilon'$ and $T \in [T_0, \bar{T}_0]$, $T_0 = Ch|\log h|$, $\bar{T}_0 = \epsilon\mu^{-1}$. Therefore, due to (2.26) we can take $T = T_0$ in (5.1) with only $O(h^s)$ difference. It happens in the proof of theorems 0.3, 0.5 and 4.3.

Then we can launch successive approximation method with the unperturbed operator

$$(5.2) \quad \bar{A} = \sum_{j,k} \bar{P}_j \bar{g}^{jk} \bar{P}_k + \bar{V},$$

$$\bar{g}^{jk} = g^{jk}(y), \quad \bar{V} = V(y), \quad \bar{P}_k = hD_k - \mu V_k(y) - \mu \sum_j (\partial_k V)(y)(x_k - y_k)$$

and plug it into (5.1). We follow [BrIvr]. In what we get then the first term does not exceed $CTh^{-1-d} = Ch^{-d}|\log h|$. Perturbation can be written as

$$\sum B_j(x_j - y_j) + \mu \sum_{j,k} B_{jk}(x_j - y_j)(x_k - y_k) + \dots$$

with h -differential operators B_* and since each factor $(x_j - y_j)$ according to transformations of [BrIvr] leads to extra factor T in the estimate, one can see easily that each next term in the successive approximations gains factor $Ch^{-1}T(T^2 + \mu T^3) \leq Ch|\log h|$ ¹⁸.

Therefore only first two terms should be considered. The first term will give exactly (5.1) with $u(x, y, t)$ replaced by $\bar{u}(x, y, t)$ and it will be exactly $\int \tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{\text{MW}}(y, \tau) \psi(y) dy$ with $O(h^s)$ error¹⁹.

The second term consists of two parts; one of them is generated by the perturbation

$$(5.3) \quad R_1 = \sum_{j,k,m} \bar{P}_j (\partial_m g^{jk})(y)(x_m - y_m) \bar{P}_k + \sum_m (\partial_m V)(y)(x_m - y_m)$$

¹⁸I remind that factor Th^{-1} comes from Duhamel principle.

¹⁹After we replaced u by $\bar{u}$ we can replace T by ∞ with $O(h^s)$ error since then (2.26) holds for any $T \geq \epsilon\rho$ with $O(h^s T^{-s})$ error and it will be exactly $\int \tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{\text{MW}}(y, \tau) \psi(y) dy$.

and it is obviously 0, while the second part is generated by

$$(5.4) \quad R_2 = \sum_{j,k} \left((P_j - \bar{P}_j) \bar{g}^{jk} \bar{P}_k + \bar{P}_j \bar{g}^{jk} (P_k - \bar{P}_k) + (P_j - \bar{P}_j) \bar{g}^{jk} (P_k - \bar{P}_k) \right)$$

and is obviously $O(h^{-d-2} \mu T^3) = O(h^{1-d})$.

Therefore in this case we can replace (2.27) by $\int \mathcal{E}^{\text{MW}}(y, \tau) \psi(y) dy$ without deterioration of the remainder estimate²⁰

► This takes care of Theorems 0.3 and 4.3. Also under microhyperbolicity condition 0.1 it takes care of Theorem 0.5.

5.2 Intermediate magnetic field. Decomposition

Now let us consider case of intermediate magnetic field $\mu_q^* \leq \mu \leq \epsilon h^{-1} |\log h|^{-1}$. Then there is a *standard zone* where we use already derived estimate for $\mathcal{R}_{1Q}$ with $T = \bar{T}_0$; this standard zone contains exterior zone $\{|\xi'''| \geq \bar{\rho}_1\}$ but could be wider. Now in this standard zone we can replace $\bar{T}_0$ by $T_0 = Ch |\log h|$.

The unexpectedly difficult (as $q = 1$) problem is to join asymptotics derived in the standard zone with cut-off operator $I - \mathcal{T} \mathcal{Q} \mathcal{T}^*$ and in the remaining non-standard zone where we employ cut-off operator $\mathcal{T} \mathcal{Q} \mathcal{T}^*$. To tackle it better let us rewrite the formula we derived for the answer:

$$(5.5) \quad h^{-1} \sum_n \int_{-\infty}^0 F_{t \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau} \bar{\chi}_{T_n}(t) \Gamma(u\psi_y Q_{ny}^t) d\tau$$

where Q_n are appropriate elements of the partition of I and T_n are already chosen. The asymptotics with this principal part and different remainder estimates were derived in section 4. Actually one can replace here T_n by larger values without affecting remainder estimate, but since we have not proven this we will do a bit differently. Considering some term here with $Q = Q_n$ and $\bar{T} = T_n$ one can rewrite it as

$$(5.6) \quad h^{-1} \int_{-\infty}^0 \sum_{0 \leq m < \infty} \phi_{m, L_m}(\tau) \left(F_{t \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau} \bar{\chi}_{\bar{T}}(t) \Gamma(u\psi_y Q_y^t) \right) d\tau$$

where $\text{supp } \phi_0 \subset [-2, 2]$, $L_0 = C\bar{\rho}_1$, $\text{supp } \phi_m \subset [-2, -1]$, $L_m = 2^m L_0$ as $m \geq 1$ and ϕ_{m, L_m} form partition of 1: $\sum_{0 \leq m < \infty} \phi_{m, L_m}(\tau) = 1$ as $\tau \leq 0$.

²⁰We need also to replace $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{\text{MW}}$ by $\mathcal{E}^{\text{MW}}$ but estimate of the approximation error is already done; in what follows we will not distinguish between $\mathcal{E}^{\text{MW}}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{\text{MW}}$ keeping in mind that we always must include an approximation error estimate in our final statement.

Note that one can rewrite each term with $m > 0$ in (5.6) as

$$(5.7) \quad \phi_{m,L_m}(hD_t) \left(\varphi_T(t) \Gamma(u\psi_y Q_y^t) \right) \Big|_{t=0}, \quad \varphi = \bar{\chi}, \quad T = \bar{T}.$$

Let us consider (5.7) with $\varphi = \chi$ and $T \geq hL_m^{-1}$. Using arguments of subsection 4.1 can estimate such term by

$$(5.8) \quad Ch^{-d-1} \rho^q L_m^2 T \times \left(\frac{h}{TL_m} \right)^s$$

where factors L_m, T are due to integrals over τ, t respectively and another factor L_m is due to calculation of the number of contributing indices α ; we assume that

$$(5.9) \quad L_m \geq C(\mu^{-1} + \rho^2).$$

The same $Ch^{-d} \rho^q L_m$ estimate holds for (5.7) terms with $\varphi = \bar{\chi}$ and $TL_m = 1$ as well. Then the sum with respect to t -partition results in $Ch^{-d} \rho^q L_m$, and then the sum with respect to τ partition results in $C\rho^q h^{-d}$ because $\max L_m \asymp 1$ here; terms with $L_m \geq C$ are less than $Ch^s L_m^{-s}$ due to standard ellipticity arguments.

Let us employ method of successive approximations described in subsection 5.1 and plug it into (5.7). The estimate $C\rho^q h^{-d}$ for the first term we have as well.

A perturbation with factor $(x_j - y_j)$ will result in either factor $CT^2 h^{-1}$ if commuting with A or $\bar{A}$ or in in factor $CT\rho^{-1}$ if commuting with Q or, what is equivalent, in factors hL_m^{-2} and $hL_m^{-1} \rho^{-1}$ respectively thus resulting in

$$(5.10) \quad Ch^{1-d} \rho^q L_m^{-1} \times \left(\frac{h}{TL_m} \right)^s, \quad Ch^{1-d} \rho^{q-1} \times \left(\frac{h}{TL_m} \right)^s$$

respectively.

Note that the commutator with Q_n (and thus the second of these expressions) appears in the sum only as $T \geq \epsilon \bar{T}$; as for $T \leq \epsilon \bar{T}$ commutators from adjacent elements compensate one another; I remind that $\bar{T} = T_n$.

Therefore taking the sum with respect to t -partition and then with respect to m we get

$$(5.11) \quad Ch^{1-d} \rho^q L_0^{-1}, \quad Ch^{1-d} \rho^{q-1} \times \left(\frac{h}{T_n L_0} \right)^s$$

respectively. We can always take $L_0 = \bar{\rho}_1$ since $T_n \geq \mu^{-1}$ for sure and get $O(h^{1-d})$. As $q \geq 2$ we can do even better but it does not matter. Then both terms in (5.11) do not exceed Ch^{1-d} and remain this way after we sum over partition in zone $\{|\xi'''\| \leq \bar{\rho}_1\}$.

So, in terms with $m > 0$ we can completely ignore partition and consider only the first term of successive approximations, Further, after this we can take $\bar{T}$ arbitrarily large (thus we can take $\bar{T} = +\infty$); then after easy calculations we get

$$(5.12) \quad \int_{-\infty}^0 \int (1 - \phi_{0,L_0}(\tau)) d\tau \mathcal{E}^{\text{MW}}(x, \tau) \psi(x) dx.$$

So we proved estimate

$$(5.13) \quad |h^{-1} \int_{-\infty}^0 (1 - \phi_{0,L_0}(\tau)) \sum_n \left(F_{t \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau} \bar{\chi}_{T_n}(t) (\Gamma u \psi_y Q_{ny}^t) \right) d\tau - \int_{-\infty}^0 \int (1 - \phi_{0,L_0}(\tau)) d\tau \mathcal{E}^{\text{MW}}(x, \tau) \psi(x) dx| \leq Ch^{1-d}.$$

Now we need to consider terms with $m = 0$ i.e.

$$(5.14) \quad h^{-1} \int_{-\infty}^0 \phi_{0,L_0}(\tau) \left(F_{t \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau} \bar{\chi}_T(t) \Gamma(u \psi_y Q_{ny}^t) \right) d\tau, \quad T = T_n.$$

Instead we consider the same expression but with $T = \bar{T}_0 = \epsilon \mu^{-1}$ and consider a correction later. We remember that $T_n \geq \bar{T}_0$ in the intermediate and interior zones. So we are considering (5.14) with $T = \bar{T}_0$.

Now we want to replace $\bar{T}_0$ by a lesser value. We could replace it by $T_0 = Ch |\log h|$ with a negligible error before but it is not the case anymore since as a result of mollification and transformation symbol of operator satisfies the only

$$(5.15) \quad |\partial_\xi^\alpha a| \leq C \bar{\rho}_1^{l-|\alpha|} |\log \bar{\rho}_1|^{-\sigma} + C$$

in the intermediate and interior zones. However then we can take there

$$(5.16) \quad T_0 = C \bar{\rho}_1^{-1} h |\log h| \leq \bar{T}_0.$$

Now let us apply the same successive approximations to calculate (5.14) with $T = T_0$.

Thus perturbation with the factor $(x_j - y_j)$ results in $T^2 h^{-1} = \bar{\rho}_1^{-2} h |\log h|^2$ factor and extra $\bar{\rho}_1^{-2} |\log h|^2$ is well absorbed by ρ^{q+1} at least as $q \geq 2$, $\mu \leq h^{-1} |\log h|^{-2}$. One can consider $q = 1$ and the exceptional case either using rescaling arguments thus punishing $T \geq h/\bar{\rho}_1$ by factor $(h/(\bar{\rho}_1 T))^s$ or just by taking the two-terms approximation instead of the one-term and proving that the second term is identically 0.

Furthermore, perturbation containing factor $\mu(x_j - y_j)(x_k - y_k)$ will get an extra factor $\mu T^3 h^{-1} = \mu h^2 |\log h|^3 \bar{\rho}_1^{-3}$ which should be treated in the same way. I leave details to the reader.

So, we can again consider only the first term of successive approximations but in contrast to the previous part we cannot tend $\bar{T} = T_n$ to infinity in this approximation term unless in the exterior zone. Then the answer will be similar to given in (5.12)

$$(5.17) \quad h^{-1} \int_{-\infty}^0 \phi_{0,L_0}(\tau) \left(F_{t \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau} \bar{\chi}_{T_0}(t) \Gamma(\bar{u}\psi_y) \right) d\tau = \int_{-\infty}^0 \int (\phi(\tau) + \omega(\tau)) d\tau \mathcal{E}^{\text{MW}}(x, \tau) \psi(x) dx$$

with

$$(5.18) \quad \omega(\tau) = T_0 h^{-1} \int_{-\infty}^0 \phi(\tau') (\tau') \hat{\chi} \left(\frac{(\tau' - \tau) T_0}{h} \right) d\tau' - \phi(\tau),$$

where $\phi = \phi_{0,L_0}$.

Here $\omega(\tau) \neq 0$ because we cannot replace $\bar{T}$ by $+\infty$. Instead we replaced back T_0 by $\bar{T}_0$ since operator $\bar{A}$ has the same propagation with respect to x properties as A and therefore even with Γ_y instead of Γ the difference is negligible.

Let us define

$$(5.19) \quad \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{Q}}^{\text{MW}}(x, 0) = (2\pi)^{-d+2r} h^{r-d} \mu^r \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}^{+r}} \int_{\Omega_{\alpha}(x, \tau)} f_1 \cdots f_r \frac{\sqrt{g}}{\sqrt{g}'''} \mathcal{Q}(\xi''') d\xi''',$$

$$(5.20) \quad \Omega_{\alpha}(x, \tau) = \left\{ \xi : V + \sum_j (2\alpha_j + 1) \mu h + \sum_{2r+1 \leq j, k \leq d} g^{jk} \xi_j \xi_k + V \leq \tau \right\},$$

where g^{jk} with $j, k = 2r + 1, \dots, d$ denote coefficients after we reduce operator $\bar{A}$ to its canonical form

$$(5.21) \quad \sum_{1 \leq j \leq r} f_j (h^2 D_j^2 + \mu^2 x_j^2) + \sum_{2r+1 \leq j, k \leq d} g^{jk} h^2 D_j D_k + V,$$

$$g''' = \det(g^{jk})_{j, k=2r+1, \dots, d}^{-1}.$$

Then $\mathcal{E}^{\text{MW}} = \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{Q}}^{\text{MW}} + \mathcal{E}_{1-\mathcal{Q}}^{\text{MW}}$. Plugging this into (5.12), (5.17) and adding we get in our calculation candidate to the final answer

$$(5.22) \quad \int \mathcal{E}^{\text{MW}}(x, 0) \psi(x) dx + \int_{-\infty}^0 \int \omega(\tau) d\tau \mathcal{E}^{\text{MW}}(x, \tau) \psi(x) dx \equiv \int \mathcal{E}^{\text{MW}}(x, 0) \psi(x) dx + \int_{-\infty}^0 \int \omega(\tau) d\tau \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{Q}}^{\text{MW}}(x, \tau) \psi(x) dx$$

modulo negligible error where $\mathcal{Q}$ is supported in $\{|\xi'''| \leq 2\bar{\rho}_1\}$ and equal 1 in $\{|\xi'''| \leq 2\bar{\rho}_1\}$.

Now it is a time to remind about correction

$$(5.23) \quad h^{-1} \sum_n \int_{-\infty}^0 \phi_{0,L_0}(\tau) \left(F_{t \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau} (\bar{\chi}_{T_n}(t) - \bar{\chi}_{\bar{T}_0}(t)) \Gamma(u\psi_y \mathcal{Q}_{n_y}^t) \right) d\tau$$

because we replaced T_n by $\bar{T}_0$ in the intermediate and interior zones. Thus the following statement is proven:

Proposition 5.1. *Let conditions of proposition 4.4 be fulfilled. Then expression (5.5) with summation over all zones modulo $O(h^{1-d})$ is equal to*

$$(5.24) \quad \int \mathcal{E}^{\text{MW}}(x, 0) \psi(x) dx + \int_{-\infty}^0 \int \omega(\tau) d\tau \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{Q}}^{\text{MW}}(x, \tau) \psi(x) dx + \\ h^{-1} \sum_n \int_{-\infty}^0 \phi_{0,L_0}(\tau) \left(F_{t \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau} (\bar{\chi}_{T_n}(t) - \bar{\chi}_{\bar{T}_0}(t)) \Gamma(U\tilde{\psi}_y \mathcal{Q}_{n_y}^t) \right) d\tau$$

where $U = \mathcal{T}^* u \mathcal{T}_y^{*t}$, $\tilde{\psi} = \mathcal{T}^* \psi \mathcal{T}$, $\mathcal{Q}_n = \mathcal{T}^* \mathcal{Q}_n \mathcal{T}$ and here we can take $\mathcal{Q}_n = \mathcal{Q}_n(hD''')$ elements of partition in zone $\{|\xi'''| \leq 2\bar{\rho}_1\}$, $\mathcal{Q} = \sum_n \mathcal{Q}_n$.

Now what we need is to estimate the sum of the second and the third terms in the right-hand expression of (5.24) (but not separately).

5.3 Decomposition. II

Let us consider remaining inexplicit terms in the the the sum in expression (5.24)

$$(5.25) \quad h^{-1} \int_{-\infty}^0 \phi(\tau) \left(F_{t \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau} (\bar{\chi}_{\bar{T}}(t) - \bar{\chi}_{\bar{T}_0}(t)) \Gamma(U\tilde{\psi}_y \mathcal{Q}_y^t) \right) d\tau$$

where we renamed ϕ_{0,L_0} into $\phi(\tau)$ (so, in (5.18) ϕ is no more ϕ_{0,L_0}) and again for the sake of simplicity we denote T_n by $\bar{T}$ and skip index n .

Let us apply the same decomposition technique to $\phi(\tau)$ as we did to 1: $\phi(\tau) = \sum_{m \geq 0} \phi_{m,L_m}(\tau)$ with lesser L_m than before and rewrite (5.25) as the sum of (5.7)-type terms

$$(5.26) \quad h^{-1} \int_{-\infty}^0 \phi_{m,L_m}(\tau) \left(F_{t \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau} (\bar{\chi}_{\bar{T}}(t) - \bar{\chi}_{\bar{T}_0}(t)) \Gamma(U\tilde{\psi}_y \mathcal{Q}_y^t) \right) d\tau$$

Replacing $(\bar{\chi}_{\bar{T}}(t) - \bar{\chi}_{\bar{T}_0}(t))$ by $\chi_T(t)$ we find that each obtained term with $m > 0$ does not exceed (5.8) again; however, there is a difference: after summation with respect to T ranging from $\bar{T}_0$ now to $\bar{T}$ we get that expression (5.26) does not exceed

$$(5.27) \quad C\rho^q h^{-d} L_m \times \left(\frac{\mu h}{L_m}\right)^s$$

as long $L_0 \geq \mu h$ and $m > 0$. After summation with respect to L_m it gives us $C\mu\rho^q h^{1-d}$.

It would enable us to set $L_0 = \mu h$ if not condition $L \geq \rho^2 + \mu^{-1} + \mu h$ we need.

Let us assume that $\mu \geq h^{-\frac{1}{2}}$; then we can take

$$(5.28) \quad L_0 = C\rho^2 + C\mu h;$$

analysis in the case $q = 1$, $h^{-\frac{1}{3}} \leq \mu \leq h^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ will be done later with or without microhyperbolicity condition.

Let us employ the same method of successive approximations with unperturbed operator $\bar{\mathcal{A}} = \mathcal{A}_0(y'', y''', \mu^{-1}hD'', hD''')$ considered as operator with operator valued symbol in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then the perturbation is

$$(5.29) \quad \sum_{r+1 \leq j \leq d} (x_j - y_j) a_j(x'', y'', x''', y''', \mu^{-1}hD'', hD''') + b(x'', y'', x''', y''', \mu^{-1}hD'', hD''')$$

with $b = O(\mu^{-1})$.

Consider the second term of approximation plugged into (5.26) with $m > 0$ and transform it in our usual way. Factor $(x_j - y_j)$ in the first part of perturbation (5.26) should commute with either $\mathcal{G}^\pm$ bringing thus factor $\rho T^2 h^{-1}$ as $2r + 1 \leq j \leq d$ or smaller factor $\mu^{-1} T^2 h^{-1}$ as $r + 1 \leq j \leq 2r$ or with $\mathcal{Q}$ bringing factor $\rho^{-1} T$. However again commuting with $\mathcal{Q}$ in the final run (after summation with respect to n) should be considered only as $T \geq \bar{T} = T_n$ and since $\bar{T} \geq \epsilon h \rho^{-2}$ due to section 4 the first factor is larger anyway.

Thus we get from the first part of perturbation terms estimated by (5.8) multiplied by one these factors: so we get

$$(5.30)_1 \quad Ch^{-d} \rho^q L \times \left(\frac{h}{TL}\right)^s \times \rho T^2 h^{-1},$$

$$(5.30)_2 \quad Ch^{-d} \rho^q L \times \left(\frac{h}{TL}\right)^s \times \mu^{-1} T^2 h^{-1},$$

$$(5.30)_3 \quad Ch^{-d} \rho^q L \times \left(\frac{h}{TL}\right)^s \times T \rho^{-1}$$

respectively because in our analysis $T \geq \epsilon \mu^{-1}$, $L \geq \mu h$.

On the other hand the second part of the perturbation (5.29) brings factor $C\mu^{-1}Th^{-1}$ or equivalently $C\mu^{-1}L^{-1}$ thus giving us

$$(5.31) \quad C\mu^{-1}\rho^q h^{-d} \times \left(\frac{h}{TL}\right)^s.$$

Summation of (5.30)₁-(5.30)₃, (5.31) with respect to L, T results in the same expressions but with the minimal possible values, i.e. $T = \mu^{-1}$ and $L = \rho^2 + \mu h$; so the result for each of the expressions (5.30)₁₋₃ does not exceed

$$(5.32) \quad C\mu^{-1}\rho^{q+1}h^{-d} \times \left(\frac{\mu h}{\rho^2 + \mu h}\right)^s,$$

while the result for (5.31) does not exceed

$$(5.33) \quad C\mu^{-1}\rho^q h^{-d} \times \left(\frac{\mu h}{\rho^2 + \mu h}\right)^s.$$

Integration over $\frac{d\rho}{\rho}$ brings instead of (5.32),(5.33) their values as $\rho = \rho_1^*$; the first one is always $O(h^{1-d})$ while the second one is $O(h^{1-d})$ as $q \geq 2$ only and is $O(\mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}h^{\frac{1}{2}-d})$ as $q = 1$. We can do better than this but marginally. We will do it later.

So, replacing U by its one-term approximation

$$(5.34) \quad \bar{U} = -ih^{-1}\bar{\mathcal{G}}^+\delta(x-y)\delta(t) + ih^{-1}\bar{\mathcal{G}}^-\delta(x-y)\delta(t)$$

in each term (5.26) with $m > 0$ brings the total error $O(h^{1-d})$ unless $q = 1$ and $\mathcal{A}$ contains (unremovable) cubic terms; in the latter case the total error is $O(\mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}h^{\frac{1}{2}-d})$.

So, let us plug $\bar{U}$ into (5.26). I remind that the symbol of $\tilde{\psi}$ is given by (3.28). But then the remainder estimate $O(\mu^{-1}|\log h|^{-1})$ there multiplied by $\bar{\rho}_1\rho^q h^{-d}$ estimate (I remind that extra factor $\bar{\rho}_1$ comes from support of ϕ) results in $O(h^{1-d})$.

Further, terms containing factors η_j^w with $j = 1, \dots, 2r$ result in 0 because these terms applied to $v(x'', x''')\Upsilon_\alpha(x')$ result in $\sum_{\beta: |\alpha-\beta|=1} v_\beta(x'', x''')\Upsilon_\alpha(x')$ while $\mathcal{A}_0$ “honors” $|\alpha|$. Finally, terms containing η_j^w with $j = 2r+1, \dots, d$ also result in 0 since we can take $\mathcal{Q}_n$ even with respect to ξ''' and $\mathcal{A}_0$ is even as well.

So we need to plug only ψ_0 instead of $\tilde{\psi}$. We can also replace T_n by any larger value, say infinity. But then using change of coordinates Ψ_0 we get exactly the second term of (5.24) with the opposite sign and with ω defined by (5.18) for $\phi = \phi_{m, L_m}$. Then we arrive to (5.24) with $L_0 = \mu h + \rho^2$ (which now depends on n).

We also need to look at the case $m = 0$. So far we considered both intermediate and interior zones. Consider now intermediate zone only. Then all above arguments remain

true with the only difference that factor $(\frac{h}{\rho^2 T})^s$ is now due to estimate (4.3) rather than τ -mollification. Therefore

$$(5.35) \quad \left| \sum_n \int_{-\infty}^0 \int \omega(\tau) d_\tau \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{Q}_n}^{\text{MW}}(x, \tau) \psi(x) dx + \right. \\ \left. h^{-1} \sum_n \int_{-\infty}^0 \phi_{0, L_0}(\tau) \left(F_{t \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau}(\bar{\chi}_{T_n}(t) - \bar{\chi}_{\bar{T}_0}(t)) \Gamma U \tilde{\psi}_y \mathcal{Q}_{n_y}^t \right) d\tau \right|$$

with summation over n such that $\mathcal{Q}_n$ belongs to intermediate zone does not exceed Ch^{1-d} if either $q \geq 2$ or $q = 1$ and $\mathcal{A}$ contains no (unremovable) cubic terms and $C\mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}h^{\frac{1}{2}-d}$ if $q = 1$ and $\mathcal{A}$ contains (unremovable) cubic terms.

Then from proposition 5.1 we arrive to

Proposition 5.2. *Let conditions of proposition 4.4 be fulfilled and let $h^{-\frac{1}{2}} \leq \mu \leq h^{-1} |\log h|^{-1}$.*

Then one can rewrite expression (5.5) as (5.24) with $L_0 = C\mu h$ and ϕ, ω defined accordingly and one should take $\mathcal{Q}_n = \mathcal{Q}_n(hD''')$ elements of partition in interior zone $\{|\xi'''| \leq \rho_1^\}$, $\mathcal{Q} = \sum_n \mathcal{Q}_n$ and the error is*

1. $O(h^{1-d})$ if either $q \geq 2$ or $q = 1$ and $\mathcal{A}$ contains no (unremovable) cubic terms;
2. $O(\mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}h^{\frac{1}{2}-d})$ if $q = 1$ and $\mathcal{A}$ contains (unremovable) cubic terms.

I remind that the only cubic terms which matter are those which do not contain hD_j with $j \geq 2r + 1$.

5.4 Interior zone. Generic settings

Now in view of proposition 5.2 we need to consider only interior zone $\{|\xi'''| \leq \rho_1^*\}$. In the generic setting there is no point to take $L_0 \leq \mu h$ because we cannot improve estimate $O(\mu h^{1-d})$ for the number of indices making contributions as τ runs an interval of length L_0 . Because of this (as $m = 0$) one should replace (5.30)₁₋₃ by

$$(5.36)_1 \quad C\mu\rho^q h^{1-d} \times \min\left(\left(\frac{h}{T\rho^2}\right)^s, 1\right) \times \rho T^2 h^{-1},$$

$$(5.36)_2 \quad C\mu\rho^q h^{1-d} \times \min\left(\left(\frac{h}{T\rho^2}\right)^s, 1\right) \times \mu^{-1} T^2 h^{-1},$$

$$(5.36)_3 \quad C\mu\rho^q h^{1-d} \times \min\left(\left(\frac{h}{T\rho^2}\right)^s, 1\right) \times T\rho^{-1}$$

respectively where factor $(\frac{h}{T\rho^2})^s$ as $T \geq h/\rho^2$ is due to estimate (4.3). Furthermore, (5.36)₃ one should count with $T \geq \epsilon T_n \asymp \rho$ only.

After summation with respect to T we get instead of (5.36)₁₋₂ their values as $T = h/\rho^2$ and instead of (5.36)₃ its value as $T = \rho$ i.e.

$$(5.37)_{1-3} \quad C\mu\rho^{q-3}h^{2-d}, \quad C\rho^{q-4}h^{2-d}, \quad C\mu\rho^qh^{1-d}\left(\frac{h}{\rho^3}\right)^s$$

respectively. After summation with respect to $\rho \geq h^{\frac{1}{3}}$ we get $O(h^{1-d})$ as $q \geq 3$, $O(\mu h^{\frac{5}{3}-d})$ as $q = 2$ and $O(\mu h^{\frac{4}{3}-d})$ as $q = 1$.

On the other hand instead of (5.31) we get

$$(5.38) \quad C\mu\rho^qh^{1-d} \times \min\left(\left(\frac{h}{T\rho^2}\right)^s, 1\right) \times \mu^{-1}Th^{-1}$$

and summation with respect to T results in $C\rho^{q-2}h^{1-d}$.

Summation of this expression with respect to ρ should be taken over $\rho \geq \max(\mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}, h^{\frac{1}{3}})$ only; it results in $O(h^{1-d})$ as $q \geq 3$, $O(h^{1-d}|\log \mu^2 h|)$ as $q = 2$ and $O(\mu^{\frac{1}{2}}h^{1-d})$ as $q = 1$.

To get rid of factor $|\log \mu^2 h|$ as $q = 2$ one should consider two-term approximation, then (5.38) will be replaced by

$$(5.38)^* \quad C\mu\rho^qh^{1-d} \times \min\left(\left(\frac{h}{T\rho^2}\right)^s, 1\right) \times \mu^{-2}T^2h^{-2}$$

which results in $C\mu^{-1}\rho^{-2}h^{1-d}$ after summation with respect to T and in $O(h^{1-d})$ after summation with respect to ρ .

On the other hand, consider the second part of perturbation (5.29); one can rewrite it as $b(y'', y''', \mu^{-1}hD'', hD''')$. Really, since this part contains unremovable cubic terms, symbol b belongs to $\mathcal{F}^{1,1}$ and thus freezing $x'' = y''$, $x''' = y'''$ one makes an error which could be accommodated in the first part of (5.29) and treated correspondingly.

However, the second term in the approximation of U is

$$(5.39) \quad \bar{U}' = -ih\bar{\mathcal{G}}^+\bar{B}\bar{\mathcal{G}}^+\delta(x-y)\delta(t) + ih\bar{G}^-\bar{B}\bar{\mathcal{G}}^-\delta(x-y)\delta(t).$$

and plugging ψ_0 instead of $\tilde{\psi}$ results in trace equal 0 because operators $\mathcal{A}_0$ and thus $\bar{\mathcal{G}}^\pm$ transform $v(x'', x''')\Upsilon_\alpha(x')$ into the sum of $v_\beta(x'', x''')\Upsilon_\beta(x')$ with $|\beta - \alpha| = 0, 2$ while $\bar{B}$ transforms $v(x'', x''')\Upsilon_\alpha(x')$ into the sum of $v_\beta(x'', x''')\Upsilon_\beta(x')$ with $|\beta - \alpha| = 1, 3$ if we consider terms $b_{jkm}\eta_j\eta_k\eta_m$ with of $j \leq 2r$, $k \leq 2r$, $m \leq 2r$.

Terms with $j \leq 2r$, $k \leq 2r$, $m \geq 2r+1$ etc and $j \geq 2r+1$, $k \geq 2r+1$, $m \geq 2r+1$ are odd with respect to ξ''' while everything else is even and thus disappear after integration

with respect to ξ''' . Furthermore, plugging $(\tilde{\psi} - \psi_0)$ instead of $\tilde{\psi}$ produces extra factor μ^{-1} in the estimate which is more than enough to compensate logarithm.

Now we need to estimate contribution of zone $\{|\xi'''| \leq \bar{\rho}_0\}$ with

- $\bar{\rho}_0 = h^{\frac{1}{3}}$ if either there are no unremovable cubic terms or $\mu \geq h^{-\frac{2}{3}}$ and
- $\bar{\rho}_0 = \mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ if there are o unremovable cubic terms and $\mu \leq h^{-\frac{2}{3}}$.

However it follows from section 4 that we can consider this zone as a single partition element and set $T_n = \bar{T}_0 = \epsilon\mu^{-1}$ here thus bringing extra term $C\bar{\rho}_0^q \bar{T}_0^{-1} h^{1-d} = C\bar{\rho}_0^q \mu h^{1-d}$ to the remainder estimate; the latter expression is equal to $O(h^{1-d})$ as $q \geq 3$, $O(\mu h^{\frac{5}{3}-d})$ as $q = 2$; as $q = 1$ this expression is equal to $C\mu h^{\frac{4}{3}-d}$ if either $\mu \geq h^{-\frac{2}{3}}$ or there are no unremovable cubic terms in $\mathcal{A}$ and it is equal to $C\mu^{\frac{1}{2}} h^{1-d}$ if $\mu \leq h^{-\frac{2}{3}}$ and there are unremovable cubic terms in $\mathcal{A}$.

So with this error one can replace U by $\bar{U}$ in (5.25). Further, we can replace $\tilde{\psi}$ by ψ_0 there with $O(h^{1-d})$ error.

Now we can preserve remainder increasing T_n to ∞ . Really, consider

$$(5.40) \quad h^{-1} \int_{-\infty}^0 \phi_{0,L_0}(\tau) \left(F_{t \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau} \chi_T(t) \Gamma \bar{U} \psi_{0,y} \mathcal{Q}_y^t \right) d\tau$$

with $T \geq Ch\rho^{-2}$; it does not exceed

$$(5.41) \quad Ch^{-d} \times \mu h \times \rho^q \times \left(\frac{h}{\rho^2 T} \right)^s$$

exactly as would be for U but now we can take any $T \geq Ch\rho^{-2}$ because $\bar{\mathcal{A}}$ is a constant coefficient operator-valued operator. Summation with respect to $T \geq T_n$ results in value of (5.41) with $T = T_n$ which is ρ in these settings i.e. we get

$$(5.42) \quad Ch^{1-d} (\rho^2 + \mu h) \rho^q \times \left(\frac{h}{\rho^3} \right)^s$$

and after summation with respect to ρ we get its value as $\rho = h^{\frac{1}{3}}$ which is $C\mu h^{\frac{q}{3}+1-d}$.

But then after obvious calculations the second and the new third term in formula (5.24) just cancel one another and we are left with just the first term.

So we had proven

Proposition 5.3. *Let conditions of proposition 4.4 be fulfilled and let $h^{-\frac{1}{2}} \leq \mu \leq h^{-1} |\log h|^{-1}$. Then one can rewrite expression (5.5) as $\int \mathcal{E}^{\text{MW}}(x, 0) \psi(x) dx$ with an error*

1. $O(h^{1-d})$ as $q \geq 3$;
2. $O(h^{1-d} + \mu h^{\frac{5}{3}-d})$ as $q = 2$;
3. $O(\mu h^{\frac{4}{3}-d})$ as $q = 1$ and either $\mu \geq h^{-\frac{2}{3}}$ or $\mathcal{A}$ contains no (unremovable) cubic terms;
4. $O(\mu^{\frac{1}{2}} h^{1-d})$ as $q = 1$, $\mu \geq h^{-\frac{2}{3}}$ $q = 1$ and $\mathcal{A}$ contains (unremovable) cubic terms.

Remark 5.4. (i) When we say unremovable cubic terms we mean terms $b_{jkm}\eta_j\eta_k\eta_m$ with $j \leq 2r$, $k \leq 2r$, $m \leq 2r$ only. Really, any other term bears extra factor ρ and if $\mathcal{A}$ contains only these terms one can take $\bar{\rho}_0 = Ch^{\frac{1}{3}}$ and the above analysis of subsections 5.3, 5.4 produces error $O(h^{1-d})$ (we get rid off factor $|\log \mu^2 h|$ in the same way as we did it for $q = 2$ in the proof of proposition 5.3).

(ii) In subsection 5.5 we show that under microhyperbolicity conditions unremovable cubic terms do not cause any corrections even as $q = 1$.

(iii) In subsection 5.6 we derive asymptotics with a better remainder estimate.

(iv) In subsection 5.7 we derive asymptotics with a correction due to unremovable cubic terms.

► Proposition 5.3 together with remainder estimate of proposition 4.4 and with mollification error estimate imply theorem 0.8.

5.5 Calculations under microhyperbolicity condition

If either $q = 2$ or $q = 1$ and there are no unremovable cubic terms, everything is easy: under microhyperbolicity condition one can replace in the estimates (5.36)₁₋₃ factor μh by factor ρ^2 as $\rho \geq \bar{\rho}_0 = Ch^{\frac{1}{3}}$; then instead of (5.37)₁₋₃ we will get

$$(5.43)_{1-3} \quad C\rho^{q-1}h^{1-d}, \quad C\mu^{-1}\rho^{q-2}h^{1-d}, \quad C\rho^{q+2}h^{-d}\left(\frac{h}{\rho^3}\right)^s$$

respectively which will result after integration over $d\rho/\rho$ in $O(h^{1-d})$ in each of them²¹.

Further, contribution of the inner core is estimated in section 4 by $C\bar{T}_0^{-1}\bar{\rho}_0^{q+2}h^{1-d} = O(\mu h^{2-d})$ as we take $T_n = \bar{T}_0$ there. So we can again replace U by $\bar{U}$ and then $\tilde{\psi}$ by ψ_0 and after this T_n by ∞ . Then after obvious calculations we estimate expression (5.26) by Ch^{1-d} and thus (5.24) will be reduced to its first term modulo $O(h^{1-d})$.

²¹Sure in the first expression as $q = 1$ we get $Ch^{1-d}|\log h|$ but we consider two-term approximation as above and also we replace $\tilde{\psi}$ by ψ_0 ; then the error term results in $O(h^{1-d})$ while the second term (5.39) resulting in 0.

On the other hand, factor μh is replaced by ρ^2 in (5.38) as well thus resulting after summation with respect to T in $C\mu^{-1}\rho^q h^{-d}$; after summation with respect to ρ we get $C\mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}h^{\frac{1}{2}-d}$ as $q = 1$. Even use of two-term approximation gives us (5.38)* multiplied by $\rho^2/(\mu h)$ and after summation with respect to T and then by ρ we get $C\mu^{-2}h^{-\frac{1}{3}-d}$ which is $O(h^{1-d})$ only for $\mu \geq h^{-\frac{2}{3}}$.

However, if $\mathcal{A}$ contains no unremovable cubic terms in the sense of remark 5.4(i), one should replace there factor $\mu^{-1}T$ by $\mu^{-1}\rho T$; thus we get $C\mu^{-1}T\rho^4 h^{-d} \min\left(\left(\frac{h}{T\rho^2}\right)^s, 1\right)$ in both cases instead of (5.38). Then after summation with respect to T we get $C\mu^{-1}\rho^2 h^{-d}$ and after integration over $d\rho/\rho$ we get $C\mu^{-1}\rho_1^{*2} h^{-d} = Ch^{1-d}$.

Also, we need to cover also the case $h^{-\frac{1}{2}}|\log h|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \leq \mu \leq h^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ (lesser μ are covered by weak magnetic field case due to microhyperbolicity) but one can weaken assumption $\mu \geq h^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ if $\mathcal{A}$ contains no unremovable cubic terms.

So, we can plug $\bar{U}$ instead of U (and ψ_0 instead of $\tilde{\psi}$) and thus we have proven

Proposition 5.5. *In frames of proposition 4.4 for $\mu \geq h^{-\frac{1}{2}}|\log h|^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ under microhyperbolicity condition 0.1 one can rewrite (5.5) as $\int \mathcal{E}^{\text{MW}}(x, 0)\psi(x) dx$ with $O(h^{1-d})$ error provided either $q = 2$ or $q = 1$ and $\mathcal{A}$ contains no unremovable cubic terms (in the sense of remark 5.4(i)).*

However, we want to get rid off this extra assumption and thus we want to consider case “ $q = 1$, $\mathcal{A}$ contains unremovable cubic terms”. To do this we must reexamine intermediate zone as well.

Our main idea is to estimate decay of $F_{t \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau} \chi_T(t) \Gamma \psi_0 \mathcal{Q}U$ more accurately, using microhyperbolicity conditions it was done in subsections 4.1-4.3, [Ivr7].

Proposition 5.6. *In frames of proposition 4.4 for $\mu \geq h^{-\frac{1}{2}}|\log h|^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ under microhyperbolicity condition 0.1*

$$(5.44) \quad |F_{t \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau} \chi_T(t) \Gamma \tilde{\psi} \mathcal{Q}U| \leq CT \rho^{q+2} h^{-d} \left(\frac{h}{T}\right)^{l-1} |\log(\frac{h}{T})|^{-\sigma} \times \min\left(\left(\frac{h}{\rho^2 T}\right)^s, 1\right)$$

as $\bar{\rho}_0 = h^{-\frac{1}{3}} \leq \rho \leq \bar{\rho}_1$, $|\tau| \leq \epsilon$.

Proof. Repeats ones of propositions 4.1, 4.2 of [Ivr7] and is based on η -approximation of $\mathcal{A}$ with $hT^{-1} \leq \eta \leq ChT^{-1}|\log h|$. $\square$

After we improved our estimate by extra factor $\left(\frac{h}{T}\right)^{l-1} |\log(\frac{h}{T})|^{-\sigma}$ we can do more precise estimates.

Obviously,

$$(5.45) \quad h^{-1} \int_{-\infty}^0 \phi_{0,L_0}(\tau) \left(F_{t \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau} \chi_T(t) \tilde{\psi} \mathcal{Q}_n U \right) d\tau = \\ i T^{-1} \left(F_{t \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau} \tilde{\chi}_T(t) \tilde{\psi} \mathcal{Q}_n U \right) \Big|_{\tau=0} - i T^{-1} L_0^{-1} \int_{-\infty}^0 \phi'_{0,L_0}(\tau) \left(F_{t \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau} \tilde{\chi}_T(t) \tilde{\psi} \mathcal{Q}_n U \right) d\tau$$

with $\tilde{\chi}(t) = t^{-1} \chi(t)$ and ϕ'_0 derivative of ϕ_0 ; I remind that $\phi_0(0) = 1$. Here L_0 could be larger than ρ^2 to accommodate $\rho \leq \mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. Then proposition 5.6 implies that for $q = 1$ the right-hand expression of (5.45) does not exceed

$$(5.46) \quad C \rho^3 h^{-d} \left(\frac{h}{T} \right)^{l-1} |\log(\frac{h}{T})|^{-\sigma} \times \min\left(\left(\frac{h}{\rho^2 T} \right)^s, 1 \right).$$

Integrating (5.46) over dT/T from $T = \bar{T}_0$ to $T = \infty$ we get this expression as $T = \bar{T}_0$ and integrating over $d\rho/\rho$ from $\rho = h^{\frac{1}{3}}$ to $\rho = \bar{\rho}_1$ as $h^{-\frac{1}{2}} |\log h|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \leq \mu \leq h^{-\frac{2}{3}}$ we get this expression as $\rho = \rho_0^*$ i.e.

$$(5.47) \quad C(\mu h)^{l+\frac{1}{2}} |\log h|^{-\sigma} h^{-d}$$

which does not exceed approximation error

$$(5.48) \quad C \mu^{-l} \bar{\rho}_1 |\log h|^{-\sigma} h^{-d} = C \mu^{\frac{1}{2}-l} h^{\frac{1}{2}-d} |\log h|^{\frac{1}{2}-\sigma}$$

as $\mu \leq h^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. So, in this case we can plug $\bar{U}$ instead of U (and ψ_0 instead of $\tilde{\psi}$).

Thus it remains to consider case $h^{-\frac{1}{2}} \leq \mu \leq h^{-\frac{2}{3}}$. Consider (5.46) with $T = \mu^{-1}$ and the last factor equal to 1. Integrating it with respect to $\frac{d\rho}{\rho}$ from $\rho = h^{-\frac{1}{3}}$ to $\rho = \mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}$, we get its value as $\rho = \mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ which is

$$(5.49) \quad C \mu^{-\frac{3}{2}} (\mu h)^{l-1} |\log h|^{-\sigma} h^{-d}$$

and which does not exceed approximation error as $l \leq \frac{3}{2}$ and $C h^{1-d}$ as $l > \frac{3}{2}$. These arguments estimate contribution of the inner core as well. Therefore we estimated properly contribution of inner zone $\{|\xi'''\| \leq C \mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}\}$.

Consider now ρ ranging from $\mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ to $\bar{\rho}_1$. We also apply the above arguments as $T \geq \mu h \geq \frac{h}{\rho^2}$, resulting after integration over dT/T in

$$(5.50) \quad C \rho^3 \mu^{1-l} |\log h|^{-\sigma} \left(\frac{1}{\mu \rho^2} \right)^s h^{-d}.$$

As $\bar{T}_0 \leq T \leq \mu h$ we apply two-term approximation method with the second term resulting in 0 and with an error estimate

$$(5.51) \quad C\rho^3 h^{-d} \left(\frac{h}{T}\right)^{l-1} |\log(\frac{h}{T})|^{-\sigma} \times \left(\frac{T}{\mu h}\right)^2 \times \min\left(\left(\frac{h}{\rho^2 T}\right)^s, 1\right)$$

which can be easily proven by arguments of propositions 4.1, 4.2, 5.5 of [Ivr7]. After integration over dT/T we get

$$(5.52) \quad C\rho^{2l-3} \mu^{-2} |\log \rho|^{-\sigma} h^{-d} \times \min\left(\left(\frac{\mu h}{\rho^2}\right)^s, 1\right).$$

Finally, integrating (5.50) over $d\rho/\rho$ in the indicated limits results in its value at the lower limit $\rho = \mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}$; this result does not exceed $\mu^{-\frac{1}{2}-l} |\log h|^{-\sigma} h^{-d}$ which again does not exceed approximation error (5.48). This is also true for (5.52) as $l < \frac{3}{2}$; as $l = \frac{3}{2}$ we get $C\mu^{-2} |\log h|^{-\sigma} h^{-d} \times |\log \mu^2 h|$ which also does not exceed approximation error.

So again we can replace U by $\bar{U}$ and $\tilde{\psi}$ by ψ_0 . Further, after this we can replace $T_n = \epsilon$ by $T_n = \infty$ with a negligible error. Thus we have proven

Proposition 5.7. *Let $q = 1$. Then in frames of proposition 4.4 for $\mu \geq h^{-\frac{1}{2}} |\log h|^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ under microhyperbolicity condition 0.1 one can rewrite (5.5) as $\int \mathcal{E}^{\text{MW}}(x, 0) \psi(x) dx$ with $O(h^{1-d} + \mu^{\frac{1}{2}-l} h^{\frac{1}{2}-d} |\log h|^{\frac{1}{2}-\sigma})$ error.*

► Proposition 5.7 together with remainder estimate of proposition 4.9 and with mollification error estimate imply theorem 0.6.

5.6 $q = 1, 2$ and constant multiplicities of f_j

If we drop all junior terms we get a family of scalar operators and everything is easy. However covering case $q = 2$ this would not cover case $q = 1$ even if unremovable cubic terms contain hD_d . So we need more delicate arguments.

Note that instead of $\mathcal{Q}_n(hD''')$ we have now $\mathcal{Q}_n(x'', x''', \mu^{-1}hD'')\mathcal{Q}'_m(hD''')$ where $\mathcal{Q}'_m$ are elements of ρ -partition, $\mathcal{Q}_n$ are elements of γ -partition with γ, ϱ introduced by (4.64)-(4.65).

Consider first elements with $\varrho \geq C\bar{\varrho}$ and $\rho \geq \epsilon\varrho$.

Then one should multiply (4.36) by $\gamma^d \times \varrho^2/\gamma$ where factor γ^d comes from $\mathcal{Q}_n$ and factor ϱ^2/γ (which is greater than μ^{-1}) comes from estimate of $|\nabla_{x'', x''', \xi'''} A|$.

Then (5.37)₁₋₃ become

$$(5.53)_{1-3} \quad C\mu\varrho^{q-1}h^{2-d}\gamma^{d-1}, \quad C\varrho^{q-2}h^{2-d}\gamma^{d-1}, \quad C\mu\varrho^{q+2}h^{1-d} \min\left(\left(\frac{h}{\varrho^3}\right)^s, 1\right)\gamma^{d-1}$$

respectively and the second and the third expressions do not exceed the first one.

On the other hand, as $\rho \leq \epsilon \varrho$, $\varrho \geq C\bar{\varrho}$ we can rescale problem to microhyperbolic with $x \mapsto x\gamma$, $h \mapsto h/(\varrho\gamma)$, $\mu^{-1}h \mapsto \mu^{-1}h\gamma^{-2}$. Then the total contribution of elements with fixed n and different m does not exceed $(5.53)_1$ again. So, $(5.53)_1$ estimates the contribution of element $\mathcal{Q}_n$.

After summation over partition $(5.53)_1$ gives

$$(5.54) \quad \mu h^{2-d} \int \varrho^{q-1} \gamma^{-1} dx'' dx''' d\xi''$$

which does not exceed the right hand expression in (0.41) (or (4.70)).

Finally the same estimate remains true as $\varrho \asymp \bar{\varrho}$ because now we estimate the contribution to each of the second and the third term of (5.5) rather than to their sum.

Similarly, if unremovable cubic terms contain factor hD_d then we get that the contribution of $\mathcal{Q}_n$ instead of (5.48) is equal to

$$(5.55) \quad C\mu h^{1-d} \varrho^q \gamma^d \min(\mu^{-1} \varrho^{-1}, 1) \leq Ch^{1-d} \varrho^{q-1} \gamma^d$$

and the total contribution of all elements does not exceed Ch^{1-d} because then μ scales as $\mu\varrho$ ²².

On the other hand, if there are unremovable cubic terms without factor hD_d then (5.55) is replaced by

$$(5.56) \quad C\mu h^{1-d} \varrho^q \gamma^d \min(\mu^{-1} \varrho^{-2}, 1) \leq Ch^{1-d} \varrho^{q-1} \gamma^d$$

and summation results in $C\mu^{\frac{1}{2}}h^{1-d}$ and Ch^{1-d} as $q = 1, 2$ respectively.

Thus we arrive to

Proposition 5.8. *Let $q = 1, 2$ and f_j have constant multiplicities.*

(i) *Let either $q = 2$ or $q = 1$ and there are no unremovable cubic terms. Then with error equal to the right-hand expression of (4.69) one can rewrite (5.5) as $\int \mathcal{E}^{\text{MW}}(x, 0) \psi(x) dx$;*

(ii) *Let $q = 1$ and there are unremovable cubic terms. Then with error equal to the right-hand expression of (4.70) plus $C\mu^{\frac{1}{2}}h^{1-d}$ one can rewrite (5.5) as $\int \mathcal{E}^{\text{MW}}(x, 0) \psi(x) dx$.*

► Proposition 5.8 together with remainder estimate of proposition 4.10 and with mollification error estimate imply theorem 0.11.

²²Parameter $\mu^{-1}h$ scales independently from μ and h because we deal with the reduced form of operator.

5.7 Improved asymptotics without microhyperbolicity

Now it is easy to prove

Proposition 5.9. *In frames of proposition 4.15(i) one can rewrite (5.5) as $\int \mathcal{E}^{\text{MW}}(x, 0)\psi(x) dx$ with an error not exceeding the right-hand expressions of (0.34), (0.36) for $q = 2, 1$ respectively.*

► Proposition 5.9 together with remainder estimate of proposition 4.15 and with mollification error estimate imply theorem 0.10(i),(iii).

A bit more sophistication requires

Proposition 5.10. *In frames of proposition 4.17(i) one can rewrite (5.5) as $\int \mathcal{E}^{\text{MW}}(x, 0)\psi(x) dx$ with an error not exceeding the right-hand expressions of (0.41), (0.42) as $q = 2, 1$ respectively;*

Proof. One needs just to replace $\tilde{\psi}$ by ψ_0 , then consider two term approximations (the second term will result in 0 in the end), and then replace T_n by ∞ . In the intermediate zone estimates repeat those of the generic case.

In the interior zone we need to consider integral (5.54) and notice that contribution in it of all elements with $c^{-1}t \leq \varrho \leq ct$, $t \leq (\mu h)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ does not exceed

$$Ch^{1-d}\varrho^{q-1}\gamma^{-1}(\varrho^2 + \nu(\mu h))$$

with ϱ defined by given γ and thus this integral does not exceed

$$Ch^{1-d} \int \varrho^{q+1}\gamma^{-1} dx + C\nu(\mu h)h^{1-d} \int \varrho^{q-1}\gamma^{-1} dx$$

and plugging $\varrho = \gamma^{\frac{l}{2}}|\log \gamma|^{-\frac{\sigma}{2}}$ and replacing dx by $\gamma^{-1}d\gamma$ we find that the first term does not exceed Ch^{1-d} provided either $q = 2$ or $q = 1$, $(l, \sigma) \succ (1, 1)$ while the second integral does not exceed

$$C\nu(\mu h)h^{1-d}\bar{\varrho}^{q-1}\bar{\gamma}^{-1} \asymp C\nu(\mu h)\bar{\varrho}^q h^{-d}$$

unless $q = 2, l = 2$ in which case the second term does not exceed $C\nu(\mu h)h^{1-d}|\log h|^{-\sigma}$. $\square$

► Proposition 5.10 together with remainder estimate of proposition 4.17 and with mollification error estimate imply theorem 0.12.

5.8 $q = 1$: asymptotics with correction

We want to improve remainder estimates in asymptotics as $q = 1$ and $\mathcal{A}$ has non-removable cubic terms. To do this we need to include some correction in $\mathcal{E}^{\text{MW}}$.

First of all, if both $\bar{\chi}$ and ϕ are proper functions²³ and $L_0 \geq C\mu h |\log h|$, we can rewrite (5.5) in (5.24) form with $O(h^s)$ error because (5.7) with $\varphi_T = \chi_T$ and with $m > 0$ is negligible as $TL_m \geq Ch |\log h|$.

To calculate the last term in (5.24) we apply the same successive approximation method as before but with unperturbed operator $\bar{\mathcal{A}} = \mathcal{A}_1(y'', y''', \mu^{-1}hD'', hD''')$ where in $\mathcal{A}_1$ we include unremovable cubic terms

$$(5.57) \quad \mathcal{M} = \mu^2 \sum_{j,k,m, \leq 2r} (b_{jkm} \eta_j \eta_k \eta_m)^w$$

but do not include similar sum with at least one of the indices j, k, m equal d ²⁴.

Then the last term in perturbation (5.29) will contain at least one factor η_d and thus we get extra factor ρ in the corresponding estimates. Then instead of unwanted term $C\rho\mu h^{1-d} \times (\mu\rho^2)^{-2}$ calculated as $\rho = \max(\mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \bar{\rho}_0)$ in an estimate we get $C\rho\mu h^{1-d} \times (\mu\rho)^{-2}$ calculated as $\rho = \max(\mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \bar{\rho}_0)$, which results in $O(h^{1-d})$; here we take the same two-term approximation. We still need to consider the second term to avoid extra $\log h$ factor. However, we need to consider it only as b contains exactly one factor hD_d because otherwise we gain one more extra factor ρ .

We also can replace $\tilde{\psi}$ by ψ_0 with impunity because the we get an error not exceeding $CL_0\rho\mu^{-1}h^{-d} = C\rho|\log h|h^{1-d}$ which does not exceed Ch^{1-d} as $\mu \leq h^{-1}|\log h|^{-3}$ and is much less than the remainder estimate otherwise (actually we can replace in the above estimate L_0 by μh but we do not need it). But then the second term in this approximation will be odd with respect to ξ_d and result in 0 in the final answer.

So, all estimates of propositions 5.3, 5.8, 5.9 related to the case “ $q = 1$ and $\mathcal{A}$ contains no unremovable cubic terms” hold for an error arising if we replace in the last term of (5.24) U by $\hat{U}$ which is the first term in our new approximations and also replace $\tilde{\psi}$ by ψ_0 . Therefore in comparison with our previous calculations we get an extra term

$$(5.58) \quad h^{-1} \sum_n \int_{-\infty}^0 \phi_{0,L_0}(\tau) \left(F_{t \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau}(\bar{\chi}_{T_n}(t) - \bar{\chi}_{\bar{T}_0}(t)) \Gamma((\hat{U} - \bar{U})\psi_{0y} \mathcal{Q}_{ny}^t) \right) d\tau$$

where $\bar{U}$ is an old first term in the approximation.

²³In [BrIvr] sense.

²⁴We also include $C\mu^{-2}\mathcal{A}_0^2$ to have operator semibounded from below.

This is a correction term in question but we want to rewrite it in more explicit form. First of all we can replace here T_n by $+\infty$ (using the same arguments as before) and also replace $\bar{T}_0$ by $\bar{T} = Ch|\log h|$ because $(F_{t \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau} \chi_T(t) \Gamma(U\psi_{0y} \mathcal{Q}_{ny}^t))$ is negligible as $T \in [\bar{T}, \bar{T}_0]$, $|\tau| \leq CL_0$ for both $\bar{U}$ and $\hat{U}$.

However if we consider

$$(5.59) \quad h^{-1} \sum_n \int_{-\infty}^0 \phi_{0,L_0}(\tau) \left(F_{t \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau} \bar{\chi}_{\bar{T}}(t) \Gamma((\hat{U} - \bar{U})\psi_{0y} \mathcal{Q}_{ny}^t) \right) d\tau$$

and apply method of successive approximation to calculate it (considering $\bar{\mathcal{A}}_0$ as an unperturbed operator and $\bar{\mathcal{A}}_1$ as a perturbed one, we can get easily an error estimate $C\rho|\log h|^2 h^{1-d}$ for it which is again less than the remainder estimate we are looking for.

Thus modulo term not exceeding remainder estimate we can rewrite (5.58) as the same expression but with $\bar{\chi}_T$ replaced by 1 and with $\bar{\chi}_{\bar{T}_0}$ replaced by 0 i.e.

$$(5.60) \quad h^{-1} \sum_n \int_{-\infty}^0 \phi_{0,L_0}(\tau) \left(F_{t \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau} \Gamma(\hat{U} - \bar{U})\psi_{0y} \mathcal{Q}_{ny}^t \right) d\tau$$

which in turn is exactly equal to $\int \mathcal{E}_{\text{corr}}^{\text{MW}}(x, 0) \psi(x) dx$ with

$$(5.61) \quad \mathcal{E}_{\text{corr}}^{\text{MW}} = (2\pi)^{-d+r} h^{r-d} \mu^r \int (1 - \phi_{0,L_0}(\tau)) \times \\ d\tau \int (\mathbf{n}(x, \tau - z^2) - \mathbf{n}_0(x, \tau - z^2)) \mathcal{Q}(z) dz \times f_1 \cdots f_r \sqrt{g}.$$

Thus we arrive to

Proposition 5.11. *Let $q = 1$, $h^{-\frac{1}{3}} |\log h|^{-\frac{1}{3}} \leq h^{-1} |\log h|^{-1}$ and $\mathcal{A}$ contain unremovable cubic terms. Let $\mathcal{R}_3$ be the difference between expression (5.5) and*

$$\int (\mathcal{E}^{\text{MW}}(x, 0) + \mathcal{E}_{\text{corr}}^{\text{MW}}(x, 0)) \psi(x) dx$$

where $\mathcal{E}_{\text{corr}}^{\text{MW}}$ is defined by (5.61) with $L_0 = C_0 \mu h |\log h|$ with large enough constant C_0 and a proper symbol $\mathcal{Q}$ equal 1 in $\{|z| \leq C\bar{\rho}_1\}$ and $\mathbf{n}_0$ and $\mathbf{n}$ are eigenvalue counting functions for operators $\mathbf{a}_0$ and $\mathbf{a}$ respectively. Then

- (i) In the general settings $\mathcal{R}_3$ does not exceed $C\mu h^{\frac{4}{3}-d}$.
- (ii) In frames of proposition 4.11 $\mathcal{R}_3$ does not exceed the right-hand expression of (4.78).
- (iii) In frames of proposition 4.15(iii) $\mathcal{R}_3$ does not exceed the right-hand expression of (4.84).

(iv) In frames of proposition 4.17(ii) $\mathcal{R}_3$ does not exceed the right-hand expression of (4.88) as (4.75) is violated.

(v) In frames of proposition 4.17(iii) $\mathcal{R}_3$ does not exceed the right-hand expression of (4.90) as (4.75) is violated.

► This proposition together with corresponding results of section 4 implies all statement of theorems dealing with $\mathcal{R}_I$ rather than $\mathcal{R}$ (theorems 0.9(i), 0.11(ii)). It also implies

Theorem 5.12. *In frames of proposition 5.11 corresponding estimates hold also for $\mathcal{R}_I$ defined by (0.28), (5.61).*

It follows from proposition 5.10(iii) that in frames of (0.33) with $\nu(\hbar) = \hbar^2$ we do not need any correction. On the other hand the following example shows the need in the correction term.

Example 5.13. Consider the case $q = 1$, $r = 2, 3$ and $f_j = \text{const}$ and comeasurable and there are unremovable cubic terms in $\mathcal{A}$ so that the $\mathcal{A}_1 = \mathcal{A}_0 + \mu^{-1}\mathcal{M}$ with $\mathcal{M}$ commuting with $\mathcal{A}$ (at each point x). Furthermore, let us assume that one of conditions is fulfilled:

$$(5.62)_2 \quad r = 2, \quad f_1 = 2f_2,$$

$$(5.62)_3 \quad r = 3, \quad f_1 = f_2 + f_3, \quad f_2 \neq f_3.$$

Then

$$(5.63)_2 \quad \mathcal{A}_0 = 2Z_1^*Z_1 + Z_2^*Z_2 + D_5^2, \quad \mathcal{M} = (\omega Z_1^*Z_2^2) + (\omega Z_1^*Z_2^2)^*,$$

$$(5.63)_3 \quad \mathcal{A}_0 = f_1Z_1^*Z_1 + f_2Z_2^*Z_2 + f_3Z_3^*Z_3 + D_7^2, \quad \mathcal{M} = (\omega Z_1^*Z_2Z_3) + (\omega Z_1^*Z_2Z_3)^*$$

respectively with $\omega = \omega(x'', x''', \mu^{-1}\hbar D'')$ ²⁵.

We can already apply proposition 5.11, getting for cR_I better estimate than estimate $C\mu^{\frac{1}{2}}\hbar^{1-d}$ for $\mathcal{R}$, but we can improve further the former one. Let us assume that $|\omega| \geq \epsilon$. Then (assuming large enough smoothness of symbols) one can apply a transformation by operator $e^{i\hbar^{-1}\mathcal{L}}$ with $\mathcal{L} = \sum_j \beta_j Z_j^* Z_j$ with Hermitean $\beta_j = \beta_j(x'', x''', \mu^{-1}\hbar D'')$ and to transform operator (modulo terms containing factors $\mu^{-1}\hbar D_d$ or μ^{-2}) to the same form but with Hermitean operator ω . So, $\mathcal{M} = \omega\mathcal{M}_0$ with

$$(5.64) \quad \mathcal{M}_0 = \begin{cases} Z_1^*Z_2^2 + Z_1Z_2^{*2} & r = 2 \\ Z_1^*Z_2Z_3 + Z_1Z_2^*Z_3^* & r = 3 \end{cases}$$

²⁵One should not forget to add $C\mu^{-2}\mathcal{A}_0^2$ to avoid some non-semiboundedness related problems.

commuting with $\mathcal{A}_0$. Then one can decompose with respect to common eigenfunctions of $\mathcal{A}_0$ and $\mathcal{M}_0$ and to break the systems into separate equations and one can easily prove that

$$(5.65) \quad \mathcal{R}_I \leq C\mu h^{\frac{3}{2}-d}$$

without any microhyperbolicity condition (which is much less than $C\mu^{\frac{1}{2}}h^{1-d}$ as $\mu h \ll 1$).

Let us select $V = -\sum_j (2\bar{\alpha}_j + 1)f_j\mu h$ and $\mu \geq h^{-\frac{1}{2}}$.

Further, let us replace $\mathbf{n}(x, -z^2, \hbar)$ by

$$(5.66) \quad \#\left\{\alpha : \sum_j (2\alpha_j + 1)f_j\mu h + V < 0\right\} + \mathbf{m}(x, -\xi_d^2, \hbar)\theta(\rho^2 - z^2)$$

where $\mathbf{m}(x, \lambda, \hbar)$ is an eigenvalue counting function for $\mathcal{M}$ restricted to the linear span of Υ_α such that $\sum_j (2\alpha_j + 1)f_j\mu h + V = 0$. Then the error in $\mathcal{E}_{\text{corr}}^{\text{MW}}$ will not exceed $C\mu\rho h^{1-d} \times (\mu\rho^2)^{-2}$. Taking $\rho = \rho_1^*$ we get this error not exceeding $C\mu^{-\frac{5}{2}}h^{-\frac{1}{2}-d} \ll \mu^{\frac{1}{2}}h^{1-d}$ as long as $\mu \gg h^{-\frac{1}{2}}$.

But then (with

$$(5.67) \quad \int \mathcal{E}_{\text{corr}}^{\text{MW}}(x, 0)\psi(x) dx = \mu^r h^{r-d} \iint \mathbf{m}(x, -\xi_d^2, \hbar)\theta(\rho^2 - \xi_d^2)\psi(x) dx d\xi_d + O(C\mu^{-\frac{5}{2}}h^{-\frac{1}{2}-d})$$

which is exactly of magnitude $\mu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \times \mu h^{1-d} = \mu^{\frac{1}{2}}h^{1-d}$ and one cannot skip it without increasing the remainder estimate.

5.9 Strong Magnetic Field

Consider now case $\epsilon h^{-1}|\log h|^{-1} \leq \mu \leq \epsilon h^{-1}$. The same arguments work again, with no exterior zone and necessity to join exterior and intermediate zones. Because of this one should deal directly with (5.5) rather than (5.24).

Then (5.5) is preserved modulo $O(h^s)$ as T_n is replaced by some lesser value which depending on assumptions is described in the previous subsections, then we apply method of successive approximations in the same way as above replacing U by $\bar{U}$ and $\tilde{\psi}$ by $|psi_0$ and estimating an error in (5.5) cause by this; finally we replace T'_n by T_n again with $O(h^s)$ error and then T_n by $+\infty$. I leave details to the reader.

Then one can easily prove

Proposition 5.14. *Let $\epsilon h^{-1} |\log h|^{-1} \leq \mu \leq \epsilon h^{-1}$, $(l, \sigma) = (1, 1)$ as $q \geq 2$, $(l, \sigma) = (1, 2)$ as $q = 1$. Then one can rewrite (5.5) as $\int \mathcal{E}^{\text{MW}}(x, 0) \psi(x) dx$ with an error not exceeding Ch^{1-d} as $q \geq 2$, $C\mu^{\frac{1}{2}}h^{1-d}$ as $q = 1$ ²⁶.*

► This statement combined with proposition 4.18 yield immediately theorems 0.13, 0.14.

Proposition 5.15. *Let $\epsilon h^{-1} |\log h|^{-1} \leq \mu \leq \epsilon h^{-1}$, $(l, \sigma) \succeq (1, 1)$ as $q \geq 2$, $(l, \sigma) \succeq (1, 2)$ as $q = 1$. Then under microhyperbolicity condition 0.1 one can rewrite (5.5) as $\int \mathcal{E}^{\text{MW}}(x, 0) \psi(x) dx$ with an error not exceeding Ch^{1-d} .*

► This statement combined with with proposition 4.19 yield immediately theorem 0.15.

Proposition 5.16. *Statements of propositions 5.8-5.11, theorem 5.12 and example 5.13 remain true as $\epsilon h^{-1} |\log h|^{-1} \leq \mu \leq \epsilon h^{-1}$.*

► This statement combined with propositions 4.20, 4.21 imply theorem 0.16.

5.10 Superstrong Magnetic Field

Consider now case $\epsilon h^{-1} \leq \mu \leq C_0 h^{-1}$. The same arguments work again, with no intermediate zone anymore. One can prove easily

Proposition 5.17. *Let $\epsilon h^{-1} \leq \mu \leq C_0 h^{-1}$, $(l, \sigma) = (1, 1)$ as $q \geq 2$, $(l, \sigma) = (1, 2)$ as $q = 1$. Then one can rewrite (5.5) as $\int \mathcal{E}^{\text{MW}}(x, 0) \psi(x) dx$ with an error not exceeding Ch^{1-d} as $q \geq 2$, $Ch^{\frac{1}{2} - d}$ as $q = 1$.*

Proposition 5.18. *Let $\epsilon h^{-1} \leq \mu \leq C_0 h^{-1}$, $(l, \sigma) = (1, 1)$ as $q \geq 2$, $(l, \sigma) = (1, 2)$ as $q = 1$. Then under microhyperbolicity condition 0.2 with ℓ independent on τ one can rewrite (5.5) as $\int \mathcal{E}^{\text{MW}}(x, 0) \psi(x) dx$ with an error not exceeding Ch^{1-d} .*

Proposition 5.19. *Statements of proposition 5.8 remain true as $\epsilon h^{-1} \leq \mu \leq C_0 h^{-1}$.*

► These statements combined with proposition 4.22 imply theorem 0.16.

²⁶One can improve it as there are no unremovable cubic terms but there is no point as the general remainder estimate $O(\mu h^{\frac{4}{3} - d})$ is larger

5.11 Ultrastrong Magnetic Field

Consider now case $\mu \geq C_0 h^{-1}$. The same arguments work again, now applied to a single scalar equation:

Proposition 5.20. *Let $\mu \geq C_0 h^{-1}$, $(l, \sigma) = (1, 1)$ as $q \geq 2$, $(l, \sigma) = (1, 2)$ as $q = 1$. Then one can rewrite (5.5) as $\int \mathcal{E}^{\text{MW}}(x, 0) \psi(x) dx$ with an error $C\mu^r h^{r-d+1}$ as $q \geq 2$, $C\mu^r h^{r-d+\frac{1}{2}}$ as $q = 1$.*

Proposition 5.21. *Let $\mu \geq C_0 h^{-1}$, $(l, \sigma) = (1, 1)$ as $q \geq 2$, $(l, \sigma) = (1, 2)$ as $q = 1$. Then under microhyperbolicity condition (0.56) one can rewrite (5.5) as $\int \mathcal{E}^{\text{MW}}(x, 0) \psi(x) dx$ with an error not exceeding $C\mu^r h^{1+r-d}$.*

► These statements combined with proposition 4.23 imply theorem 0.17.

References

- [BrIvr] M. BRONSTEIN, V. IVRII. *Sharp Spectral Asymptotics for Operators with Irregular Coefficients. Pushing the Limits*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations, **28** (2003) 1&2, 99–123.
- [Dim] M. DIMASSI. *Développements asymptotiques de l'opérateur de Schrödinger avec champ magnétique fort*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations, **26** (2001) 3&4, 595–627.
- [Har] G. HARMAN. *Metric Number Theory*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1998, xviii+297.
- [Ivr1] V. IVRII. *Microlocal Analysis and Precise Spectral Asymptotics*, Springer-Verlag, SMM, 1998, xv+731.
- [Ivr2] V. IVRII. *Asymptotics of the ground state energy of heavy molecules in the strong magnetic field. I*, Russian Journal of Math. Phys., **4** (1996) 1, 29–74.
- [Ivr3] V. IVRII. *Asymptotics of the ground state energy of heavy molecules in the strong magnetic field. II*, Russian Journal of Math. Phys., **5** (1997) 3, 321–354.
- [Ivr4] V. IVRII. *Sharp Spectral Asymptotics for Operators with Irregular Coefficients*, Internat. Math. Res. Notices, (2000) 22, 1155–1166.
- [Ivr5] V. IVRII. *Sharp Spectral Asymptotics for operators with irregular coefficients. II. Boundary and Degenerations*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations, **28** (2003) 1&2, 125–156.

- [Ivr6] V. IVRII. *Sharp spectral asymptotics for operators with irregular coefficients. III Schrödinger operator with a strong magnetic field, (to appear).*
- [Ivr7] V. IVRII. *Sharp spectral asymptotics for operators with irregular coefficients. IV Multidimensional Schrödinger operator with a strong magnetic field. Full-rank case, (in progress).*
- [Ivr8] V. IVRII. *Accurate spectral asymptotics for periodic operators*, Journées "Équations aux Dérivées Partielles" (Saint-Jean-de-Monts, 1999), Exp. No. V, 11 pp., Univ. Nantes, Nantes, 1999.
- [MeRo] M. MELGAARD, G. ROZENBLUM *Eigenvalue asymptotics for weakly perturbed dirac and Schrödinger operators with constant magnetic fields of full rank*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations, **28** (2003) 1&2, 1–52.
- [Rai1] G. RAIKOV. *Border-line eigenvalue asymptotics for the Schrödinger operator with electromagnetic potential* Integral Equations, Operator Theory, **14** (1991) 6, 875–888.
- [Rai2] G. RAIKOV. *Strong electric field eigenvalue asymptotics for the Schrödinger operator with electromagnetic potential*, Lett. Math. Phys., **21** (1991) 1, 41–49.
- [Rai3] G. RAIKOV. *Strong-electric-field eigenvalue asymptotics for the perturbed magnetic Schrödinger operator* Comm. Math. Phys., **155** (1993) 2, 415–428.
- [Rai4] G. RAIKOV. *Semiclassical and weak-magnetic-field eigenvalue asymptotics for the Schrödinger operator with electromagnetic potential*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Phys. Théor., **61** (1994) 2, 163–188.
- [Rai5] G. RAIKOV. *Eigenvalue asymptotics for the Schrödinger operator in strong constant magnetic fields* Comm. Partial Differential Equations, **23** (1998) 9–10, 1583–1619.

February 2, 2008

Department of Mathematics,
 University of Toronto,
 100, St. George Str.,
 Toronto, Ontario M5S 3G3
 Canada
 ivrii@math.toronto.edu
 Fax: (416)978-4107